

Differentiation, implicit functions, and applications to generalized well-posedness

by

Seppo Hiltunen

Abstract. This article is centered around generalizing a previous implicit function theorem of the author to be applicable for maps $f : E \sqcap F \rightarrow F$ which can be lifted to Keller C_π^k -maps $f_i : E \sqcap F_i \rightarrow F_i$ with F_i Banach and $F = \text{proj lim } F_i$. We prove theorems about existence and differentiability of functions g satisfying $f(x, g(x)) = b$ constant. In addition to these abstract theorems, we give several examples of applications to proving smooth dependence of the solution on initial/boundary values and the nonlinearity in nonlinear (partial) differential equations.

Keywords: implicit functions, smooth solution maps, well-posedness, projective limits, locally convex spaces, Banach spaces, differentiability, smoothness, holomorphy.

Subject classification: 58C15, 47J07, 46T20, 46T25, 35B30. (AMS 2000)

0

Introduction

On $Q_I = I \times \mathbb{R}^N$ with $I = \mathbb{R}_+$ or $I = [0, T]$ for $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$, consider a nonlinear partial differential equation $\partial_0 y = Py + \varphi \circ [\text{id}, Ry]$ with initial condition $y(0, \cdot) = y_0$ for functions $y : Q_I \rightarrow Y$. Here Y is a finite dimensional real vector space, and P, R are linear partial differential operators not containing "time" derivatives, and we define $[\text{id}, z](\xi) = (\xi, z(\xi))$ for $\xi = (t, \eta) \in Q_I$. For example, the nonlinear scalar wave equation $\square u = u_{tt} - \Delta u = \psi(t, \eta; u, u_t, \text{grad } u)$ with $u(0, \cdot) = u_0$ and $u_t(0, \cdot) = u_1$ can be put in the previous form by defining $Py = [\mathbf{0}, \Delta u]$ and $Ry = [u, v, \text{grad } u]$, when we have $y = [u, v]$, and $\varphi(t, \eta; \xi_1, \xi_2, \zeta) = (\xi_2, \psi(t, \eta; \xi_1, \xi_2, \zeta))$.

Well-posedness of the above initial value problem traditionally refers to a result of the type that for each initial value y_0 in a set O in some function space E_0 there is a unique solution y in a space $F = F_I$ of functions $Q_I \rightarrow Y$. One might require O to be open in E_0 , and moreover, that the map $g : E_0 \rightarrow F$ given by $O \ni y_0 \mapsto y$ is continuous. Instead of continuity of this *solution map* g , one might be interested to know whether it is of class C^1 or smooth or analytic.

The choice of the space F depends on E_0 and the conditions imposed on φ . If φ is smooth, one might be able to prove *regularity* results saying that for example the solutions y are smooth, and one then wishes to choose as F some space of smooth functions. In the articles [Po1] and [Po2], Poppenberg considers nonlinear Schrödinger equations $i\partial_0 y = \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, \text{grad } y, \Delta y]$ with $y(0, \cdot) = y_0$. Using inverse and implicit function theorems of Nash–Moser type, he obtains existence of *continuous* and C^1 solution maps $y_0 \mapsto y$. Poppenberg's most strict space F is isomorphic to $C^1(I, E_0)$ which is obtained in [Po1] with $E_0 = H^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.

In [PS; Thm. 1, p. 171], the authors sketch a "local" well-posedness assertion about a $\mathcal{Lip}^0$ solution map $g : E_0 \supseteq O \rightarrow F$ of Banach spaces for a scalar wave equation $\square u = u^k \cdot \prod_{i=0}^N (\partial_i u)^{\alpha_i}$ obviously required to satisfy by u only in some

weak sense. In [KR], no continuity of the solution map g is even asserted. Further parallel theorems about at most continuous normable space solution maps for nonlinear wave equations can be found in [Ge], [KS], [Z], to give some examples for background. These well-posedness assertions with solution maps g are roughly of the kind where $E_0 \cong H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \dots \cap H^{\sigma-i}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\sigma < \infty$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and F isomorphic to a subspace of $C(I, E_0)$. A tendency in research has been to find minimal σ , that is, as loose initial value space E_0 as possible.

We want to go in the other direction and see what can be said about a solution map if E_0 is taken a non-normable space of smooth functions with correspondingly more strict F . Further, we also wish to vary the "nonlinearity" φ in a suitably wide locally convex space E_1 of smooth functions, and still obtain a *smooth* solution map $\Sigma : E = E_0 \cap E_1 \supseteq U \rightarrow F$ defined by $x = (y_0, \varphi) \mapsto y$. In the still unfinished paper [Hi4], we study this kind of *generalized* well-posedness for the previous wave equation $\square u = \psi \circ [\text{id}; u, \partial_0 u, \text{grad } u]$.

As a tool in this work we use a corollary (= Theorem 4.3 below) of the implicit function theorem [Hi1; p. 235] of the present author. Since a detailed proof of existence and smoothness of Σ requires a fair amount of space it would have been impractical to include it together with the required background material in one article. Hence, we have chosen to develop here the required differential calculus and present the proofs of the implicit function theorems. Then (in Section 5 below) we give various less laborious examples which illustrate the technique of application of our implicit function theorems 4.1, 4.3, and 4.5 to (generalized) well-posedness questions of the type exemplified by the above wave equation.

The physical motivation for this kind of study may be seen as follows. Physicists tend to propose various particular nonlinear functions as some kind of "corrections" to traditional linear partial differential equations used to model natural phenomena. There may not be any firm ground for the assumption that a particular proposition would represent the "right" natural law. Instead, one can think that it is only an approximation, and that the "right" law is in some neighborhood of the proposed one. One then would wish that a small smooth change in the parameter law causes a corresponding smooth change in the observable phenomenon represented by the solution of the equation. Thanks to our implicit function theorems of Section 4 below, we can handle parameter changes in open sets of general locally convex spaces. A restriction of the Nash–Moser theorems is that there the parameter must vary in an open set of a graded Fréchet space.

However, our theorems of Section 4 have a flaw associated with the so-called "loss of derivatives". A partial remedy (at the cost of increase of complexity of the required proofs in applications) for this flaw is given by our newest implicit function theorem in [Hi3]. Besides proving the new implicit function theorem in that paper, we develop a general scheme, the concept of *Banach space situation*, in order to be able to formulate various implicit and inverse function theorems within a unified framework so that their differences can be seen more clearly.

To illustrate the motivation for the approach used in [Hi3], we take the previous initial value problem $\partial_0 y = Py + \varphi \circ [\text{id}, Ry]$ with $y(0, \cdot) = y_0$ which also can

be written as an integral equation $y(t, \cdot) = y_0 + \int_0^t (Py + \varphi \circ [\text{id}, Ry])(t, \cdot) dt$. This reformulation, however, generally leaves us a "loss of derivatives" — a phrase without precise meaning unless we specify a sufficiently structured situation. Alternatively, in favourable cases we can invert the linear map $y \mapsto (y_0, \partial_0 y - Py)$ by some Λ , in which case we can write the problem as $y = \Lambda(y_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, Ry])$.

For our theorems of Section 4 to be applicable here, it is required that the partial differential operator P suitably "dominates" R in the sense that the space F can be expressed as a projective limit of a system $\mathcal{F} = \langle F_i \rangle$ of Banach spaces in such a way that we then obtain C_{Π}^k maps $f_i : E \cap F_i \rightarrow F_i$ defined by the prescription $(x, y) = (y_0, \varphi, y) \mapsto y - \Lambda(y_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, Ry])$.

Nash–Moser theorems as well as our newest implicit function theorem in [Hi3] are applicable in situations with "loss of derivatives" — this loosely referring to the fact that we only have maps $f_{ij} : E \cap F_j \rightarrow F_i$ with i sufficiently preceding j in the partial order associated with the projective system $\mathcal{F}$. This kind of theorems are sometimes called "hard", obviously not because they would be particularly hard to prove but because their application requires lots of work.

Nash–Moser implicit function theorems for a map $f : E \cap F \rightarrow F$ require both spaces E, F to be (graded) Fréchet, whereas for our theorems of Section 4 below and in [Hi3] neither space needs to be Fréchet. This is utilized in [Hi2] where we construct the Lie group $\text{Diff}(M)$ of diffeomorphisms of a smooth finite dimensional paracompact (but not necessarily second countable) manifold M using Theorem 4.3 as a tool. There we have $E = F = \mathcal{D}(\tau_B M)$, the inductive limit space of compactly supported smooth sections of the tangent bundle $\tau_B M$ of M which is analogous to the test function spaces $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$.

We remark that in [Hi4] we also consider solution maps for the more general quasilinear ("perturbations of" the) wave equations $L(y)y = \varphi \circ (\bar{J}y)$, where $\bar{J}y = [\text{id}; y, \partial_0 y, \partial_1 y, \dots, \partial_N y]$ and $L(y)v = \sum_{\iota_1=0}^N \sum_{\iota_2=0}^N \varphi^{\iota_1 \iota_2} \circ (\bar{J}y) \cdot (\partial_{\iota_1} \partial_{\iota_2} v)$, and we also allow y to have values in a possibly infinite dimensional Hilbert space. For these, however, we have to apply the methods of [Hi3], and the differentiability properties of the resulting solution maps are generally worse than in the case of the "pure" wave equations $\square y = \varphi \circ (\bar{J}y)$.

The organization of the present article is as follows.

In Section 1, we introduce our formalism for treating locally convex spaces which we always require to be Hausdorff. It is a common habit to denote the algebraic–topological structure and the underlying set of a topological vector space by the same symbol, say ' E '. This convention has the defect that in contexts where an explicit distinction has to be made, one has to insert additional verbal explanations and use various ad hoc notations. To avoid the need to resort to such unaesthetic means, and to have a unified formalism, we have abandoned the usual ambiguous convention. Instead, we understand that a *locally convex space* is the algebraic–topological structure $E = (X, \mathcal{T})$, where further the pair $X = (a, c)$ is the underlying *vector structure* with a the vector addition and c the scalar multiplication. The underlying set is denoted by $v_s E$, and is determined by any of the sets $a, c, \mathcal{T}$, since for example it equals the range of both functions a and c , and

is the largest member of the topology $\mathcal{T}$.

In Section 2, we introduce the locally convex spaces F of C^i -functions $y : \Pi \supseteq Q \rightarrow \Pi_1$ needed to obtain the (generalized) well-posedness results in Section 5 below. Here Π, Π_1 are locally convex with Π always finite dimensional. We mainly need the case where also Π_1 is such, and then F is Fréchet or Banach. Of central importance in obtaining the results of Section 5 is the knowledge of smoothness of maps like $f : (x, y) \mapsto x \circ [\text{id}, y] = z$, where $z(\eta) = x(\eta, y(\eta))$ for $\eta \in Q$. Lemma 2.7 prepares us for Theorem 3.6 which gives smoothness of f .

In [Hi2] for the construction of the differentiable structure for the group of diffeomorphisms, we need some spaces of compactly supported smooth functions. Section 2 here being the natural place for the introduction of these spaces, we have included their definitions there although we do not need them in the present article. An analogous remark applies to the spaces of functions with bounded partial derivatives which are needed in the treatment of the wave equation.

Section 3 contains the background about differentiability concepts and results for maps between general locally convex spaces needed to state and prove the implicit function theorems of Section 4 and their applications later.

In Section 5, we give several examples to illustrate the technique of application of the theorems of Section 4. In these examples, we prove smooth dependence of the solution on initial/boundary data and the nonlinearity for nonlinear (partial) differential equations. We have chosen the examples so that fairly complete proofs could be presented in reasonable space, and hence the results here are not supposed to be an addition of utmost importance to the mainstream of research.

The purpose of Section 6 is to present a formalization of some well-posedness concepts which in the literature are generally used only in a loose manner. We just propose some definitions, and then give several examples where previous known results are formulated with the aid of our precise concepts. The purpose of the introduction of these concepts is to make possible the exact formulation of different "intuitive" well-posedness results so that one could more clearly see the differences between the "nature" of these results despite the fact that they concern (partial) differential equations of various kind.

To be able to express our assertions concisely and precisely at the same time, and to avoid the use of various ad hoc notations, we follow a rather strict set theoretic formalism in the spirit of [Ky; Appendix, pp. 250–281], with only few exceptions. To spare the reader some of the annoying trouble of searching the definition of each particular notation from the body of the text, we have here collected some of our general set theoretic notations under the title

Some conventions. The symbol $\mathbf{K}$ will generally denote either the field $\mathbf{R}$ of *real numbers* or $\mathbf{C}$ of *complex numbers*. The underlying sets of these fields we write $\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$, respectively. We put $\mathbb{R}^+ = \{s \in \mathbb{R} : s > 0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+ = \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$. The set of *integers* is $\mathbb{Z} = \bigcap \{Z : 0 \in Z \subseteq \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \forall n \in Z ; n+1, n-1 \in Z\}$, and we put $\mathbb{Z}^+ = \mathbb{Z} \cap \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$. The set of *natural numbers* is $\mathbb{N}_0 = \bigcap \{N : \emptyset \in N \text{ and } \forall k \in N ; k^+ \in N\}$, where $k^+ = k \cup \{k\}$. Also let $k^{++} = (k^+)^+$. We put $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. There is a natural bijection $\beta : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$,

and we shall generally "identify" $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\beta(k) \in \mathbb{Z}$ by using the same symbol for them. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we then may write $k^+ = k + 1 = \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. If we had to make an explicit distinction, we would write $\iota_n k = \beta(k)$ and $\nu_1 n = n = \beta^{-1}(n)$. For a finite function $\sigma : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, we write

$$\sum \sigma = \beta(\text{Card}(\bigcup \{\{i\} \times \beta^{-1}(n) : (i, n) \in \sigma\})),$$

which more descriptively could also be written $\sum_{i \in D} \sigma(i)$.

We use the word "family" as a synonym for "function". We put $\langle t_z : z \in S \rangle = \{w : \exists z \in S ; w = (z, t_z)\}$. A *finite sequence* is any function x with $k = \text{dom } x \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then we may write $x = \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle = \langle x_{i+1} : i \in k \rangle$. If also $y = \langle y_1, \dots, y_l \rangle$, then $x \hat{\cdot} y = \langle x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_l \rangle$. Finite sequences are things different from "tuples", which are defined by the recursion schema $(x) = x$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_l, x_{l+1}) = ((x_1, \dots, x_l), x_{l+1})$. We shall apply the definition schema

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1^1, \dots, x_{i_1}^1 ; x_1^2, \dots, x_{i_2}^2 ; \dots, x_1^k, \dots, x_{i_k}^k) \\ = ((x_1^1, \dots, x_{i_1}^1), (x_1^2, \dots, x_{i_2}^2), \dots, (x_1^k, \dots, x_{i_k}^k)), \end{aligned}$$

from which we in particular get $(x_1, \dots, x_k ; y_1, \dots, y_l) = (x_1, \dots, x_k, (y_1, \dots, y_l))$.

The *value*, cf. [Ky; p. 261, Def. 68], of a function f at x is $f \hat{\cdot} x = f \hat{\cdot} (x)$, which we generally (following the usual customs) write simply $f(x)$, and sometimes¹ even $f x$ or f_x . Let $f[A] = f \hat{\cdot} A = \{y : \exists x \in A ; (x, y) \in f\}$. Adapting [Ky; p. 259, Defs. 51, 52], for any ordered pair $P = (A, B)$, we write $A = \sigma_{rd} P$ and $B = \tau_{rd} P$. Recursively, we define $\sigma_{rd}^i Z$ by $\sigma_{rd}^0 Z = Z$ and $\sigma_{rd}^{i+1} Z = \sigma_{rd}(\sigma_{rd}^i Z)$. The *inverse* of a class f is $f^{-1} = \{(y, x) : (x, y) \in f\}$. We write $\mathcal{T} \cap A = \{U \cap A : U \in \mathcal{T}\}$, for example trace of a topology or filter.

For functions f, g the symbol $[f, g]$ denotes the function $(\text{dom } f) \cap (\text{dom } g) \ni x \mapsto (f(x), g(x))$, and $f \times_2 g$ is defined by $(x, y) \mapsto (f(x), g(y))$. We write $\text{id} = \{(x, x) : x = x\}$, the identity function on the universe $\mathbf{U} = \{x : x = x\}$.

Recalling (cf. [Ky; Def. 1, p. 252], [Du; Notes A2, p. 408]) that a class x is called a *set* iff $x \in y$ for some y , and otherwise a *proper* class, a *large family* is a function which is not a set, otherwise a *small* family.

In general, we follow the principle that if we have a term 'tx' with one free variable 'x', we apply the scheme for recursive definition that $t^0 x = x$ and $t^{k+1} x = t(t^k x)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This gives meaning for example to $\text{dom}^2 f$ once we have defined $\text{dom } f = \{x : \exists y ; (x, y) \in f\}$. Also note $\text{rng } f = \text{dom } f^{-1}$ for any class f .

With only some conventional exceptions, for example $x + yz = x + (yz)$, if we have "binary symbols" $b_k, \dots, b_1$, we follow the principle of *reduction of parentheses* given by the scheme $x_k b_k \dots x_1 b_1 x_0 = (x_k b_k \dots x_1) b_1 x_0$. In this manner, for example $A \cup B \cup C$ and $[f, g, h]$ are defined. Usually $x \hat{\cdot} y \hat{\cdot} z \neq x \hat{\cdot} (y \hat{\cdot} z)$.

We further list some definitions:

$$\mathcal{T}\text{-closure of } A = \text{Cl}_{\mathcal{T}} A = (\bigcup \mathcal{T}) \setminus \bigcup \{U \in \mathcal{T} : A \cap U = \emptyset\},$$

$$\mathcal{T}\text{-interior of } A = \text{Int}_{\mathcal{T}} A = \bigcup \{U \in \mathcal{T} : U \subseteq A\},$$

$$\mathcal{T} \times_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{U} = \{\bigcup \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \{U \times V : U \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } V \in \mathcal{U}\}\}$$

= the Tihonov/Tychonoff product topology of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{U}$,

$$f \cdot g = \{(x, y) : \exists v, z ; (x, v) \in f \text{ and } (x, z) \in g \text{ and } (z, y) \in v\},$$

¹Note that $x(i) = x_{i+1}$ when $x = \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$.

if f, g are functions with $f \cdot x$ a function having
 $g \cdot x \in \text{dom}(f \cdot x)$ for $x \in D = (\text{dom } f) \cap (\text{dom } g)$, then
 $f \cdot g$ is the function $D \ni x \mapsto f \cdot x \cdot (g \cdot x) = (f(x))(g(x))$.

Hoping that these examples have sufficiently illustrated our principles of defining notations, sometimes (hopefully) self-explanatory notations and abbreviations will be used, as for example $\langle t_i \rangle = \langle t_i : i \in I \rangle$, when I is clear from the context. The internal references we make so that for example Theorem 3 means that theorem in the same section, Theorem 4.3 refers to theorem 3 of section 4.

1 Conventions for locally convex spaces

We consider real or complex Hausdorff locally convex topological vector spaces. Precisely, this means the following. Letting $\mathbf{K}$ be either $\mathbf{R}$ or $\mathbf{C}$, we understand that $\mathbf{K} = (a_{\mathbf{K}}, c_{\mathbf{K}})$, where $a_{\mathbf{K}}, c_{\mathbf{K}} : \mathbb{K}^{\times 2} = \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ are the field addition and multiplication, respectively. Then a vector space over $\mathbf{K}$, or a $\mathbf{K}$ -vector space is a pair $X = (a, c)$ where for some nonempty set S we have the functions $a : S^{\times 2} \rightarrow S$ and $c : \mathbb{K} \times S \rightarrow S$, the vector addition and scalar multiplication, respectively. Writing $\mathbf{K} = (\mathbf{K}, \tau_{\mathbf{K}})$, where $\tau_{\mathbf{K}}$ is the natural/standard topology of $\mathbb{K}$, we have $\mathbf{K}$ a topological field. A topological $\mathbf{K}$ -vector space now is any pair/triplet $E = (X, \mathcal{T}) = (a, c, \mathcal{T})$ where $X = \sigma_{rd} E$ is a $\mathbf{K}$ -vector space and $\mathcal{T}$ is a topology (= set of open sets) on the *underlying set* $S = v_s E = v_s X = \text{rng } a = \bigcup \mathcal{T}$ such that a and c are continuous $\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{K}} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, resp.

We write $\text{TVS} = \text{TVS}(\mathbf{K})$ for the class of all topological $\mathbf{K}$ -vector spaces E having $\mathcal{T} = \tau_{rd} E$ a Hausdorff topology, the notation indicating that ' $(\mathbf{K})$ ' may be dropped if the scalar field is understood from the context, or unessential. We denote by LCS and BaS the subclasses of TVS having as members the locally convex ones or Banach((iz)able) spaces, respectively.

The zero vector of $E \in \text{TVS}$ is $\mathbf{0}_E = \bigcup \{x : (x, x, x) \in \sigma_{rd}^2 E\}$. The filter of zero neighborhoods is written $\mathcal{N}_o E$, and the von Neumann bornology (= set of bounded sets) is $\mathcal{B}_s E$. In a connection where we are dealing with a Banachable space E with a specified norm $x \mapsto \|x\|$, we may use the notations $B_E(R) = \{x : \|x\| < R\}$ and $\bar{B}_E(R) = \{x : \|x\| \leq R\}$, although this is not quite logical since the topology does not determine the norm, cf. [Jr; p. 115].

For $X = (a, c) \in \text{VS}(\mathbf{K})$ and any S writing $X|_S = (a|_{S^{\times 2}}, c|_{(\mathbf{U} \times S)})$, we further put $E|_S = (X|_S, \mathcal{T} \cap S)$ when $E = (X, \mathcal{T})$ is any topological vector space. If we have a topological vector space F of functions $Q \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ with $\sigma_{rd} F$ a vector substructure of $\mathbf{K}^Q$ for some set Q , then we write $0_Q = Q \times \{0\} = \mathbf{0}_F$.

By a *vector map* (of l.c.s. = locally convex spaces) we here mean any triple $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f)$, where $E, F \in \text{LCS}$ and f is a function with $f \subseteq (v_s E) \times (v_s F)$, cf. [Hi1; p. 238]. The set of continuous linear maps $E \rightarrow F$ we denote by $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$, and then the *class* of continuous linear maps (of l.c.s.) is $\mathcal{L} = \{(E, F, \ell) : E, F \in \text{LCS} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)\}$. The product of $E, F \in \text{LCS}$ we write $E \sqcap F$, and of a nonempty small family $\mathbf{E} \in \text{LCS}^I$ correspondingly $\prod \mathbf{E}$, and further $E^I = \prod (I \times \{E\})$.

Then $\tau_{rd} \mathbf{K}^k = \tau_{\mathbb{K}}^k$. We put $|x| = (\sum_{i=1}^k |x_i|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for $x = \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \in \mathbb{K}^k$.

A *direction* on a set I_1 is any reflexive and transitive relation Δ with $\text{dom } \Delta = I_1$, and such that any $i, j \in I_1$ have some k with $(i, k), (j, k) \in \Delta$. A family $\mathcal{P} = \{(i, j; F_j, F_i, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\} \in \mathcal{L}^\Delta$ we call a *projective system* in LCS iff Δ is a direction on some I_1 , and $\rho_{ii} \subseteq \text{id}$ and $\rho_{ij} \circ \rho_{jk} = \rho_{ik}$ hold for $(i, j), (j, k) \in \Delta$. Then a *cone* over $\mathcal{P}$ is any pair (E, ρ) , where $\rho = \langle (E, F_i, \rho_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle \in \mathcal{L}^{I_1}$ with $\rho_i = \rho_{ij} \circ \rho_j$ for all $(i, j) \in \Delta$. A *projective limit* of $\mathcal{P}$ is any cone (F, π) with $\pi = \langle (F, F_i, p_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle$ such that for every cone (E, ρ) , there is a unique $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$ with $\rho_i = p_i \circ \ell$ for all $i \in I_1$.

One observes that for nonempty I_1 , in a cone (E, ρ) over some $\mathcal{P}$ the space E is determined by ρ since $E = \bigcup (\text{dom}(\text{rng } \rho))$. Thus if one wants to restrict for nonempty ρ only, a cone could equally be defined as the family ρ . A projective limit $(F, \emptyset)$ necessarily has F trivial, i.e., $v_s F = \{\mathbf{0}_F\}$. In the sequel, we shall need only nontrivial projective limits. Thus to avoid the need to write down unnecessary information, we now adopt the convention that a *projective limit* is the family π above which we always assume to be nonempty.

For further facts about locally convex projective limits the reader may consult [Ho; Exe. 2.11.3, p. 155] and [Jr; pp. 37–38]. In particular $\tau_{rd} F$ is the smallest (= weakest) locally convex topology for $\sigma_{rd} F$ such that $p_i \in \mathcal{L}(F, F_i)$ for all i . We also have $\bigcap \{p_i^{-1}[\{\mathbf{0}_{F_i}\}] : i \in I_1\} = \{\mathbf{0}_F\}$, and $[p_i : i \in I_1] : x \mapsto \langle p_i x : i \in I_1 \rangle$ defines a topological linear isomorphism of F onto the topological linear subspace G of $\prod \langle F_i : i \in I_1 \rangle$ with $v_s G$ consisting of $\langle x_i : i \in I_1 \rangle$ having $x_i = \rho_{ij} x_j$ for all $(i, j) \in \Delta$. The limit space F is already determined by any "tail" because of

1 Lemma. *If $\langle (F, F_i, p_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle$ is a projective limit of $\{(i, j; F_j, F_i, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$ and $\emptyset \neq J \subseteq I_1 \subseteq \Delta^{-1}[J]$, then also $\langle (F, F_i, p_i) : i \in J \rangle$ is a projective limit of $\{(i, j; F_j, F_i, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta \cap J^{\times 2}\}$.*

Proof. Given a locally convex space E and $\rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(E, F_i)$ with $\rho_i = \rho_{ij} \circ \rho_j$ for $(i, j) \in \Delta \cap J^{\times 2}$, it suffices to show that there is a unique $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$ with $\rho_i = p_i \circ \ell$ for all $i \in J$. To see existence of ℓ , we first observe that for every $i \in I_1 \setminus J$, there is a unique ρ_i with $\rho_i = \rho_{ij} \circ \rho_j$ for all $j \in J$ with $(i, j) \in \Delta$. Then we obtain existence of a unique ℓ with $\rho_i = p_i \circ \ell$ for $i \in I_1$. Uniqueness of ℓ under the restriction $i \in J$ now easily follows. $\square$

Note that in the above proof we needed the assumption that Δ is a direction. In [Ho; Exe. 2.11.3, p. 155], this is not (at least explicitly) assumed, cf. [Ho; Exe. 2.12.4, p. 174], where it is explicit. Observe that Horváth's order (loc. cit., p. 2) includes antisymmetry, which we do not require for a direction.

For locally convex spaces $E = (X, \mathcal{T})$ and $F = (Y, \mathcal{U})$, we write $E \leq F$ iff $\text{id}_V F = \text{id} \mid (v_s F) \in \mathcal{L}(F, E)$, i.e., the identity function is linear $Y \rightarrow X$, which means that Y is a vector substructure of X , and continuous $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. The proper class $\leq_{\text{LCS}} = \{(E, F) : E \leq F\}$ is a reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive relation. If $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ is lower $\leq_{\text{LCS}}$ -bounded and downwards/left $\leq_{\text{LCS}}$ -directed, we then have $\leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-inf } \mathcal{F} = \bigcap \{E : E \text{ greatest lower } \leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-bound of } \mathcal{F}\} \in \text{LCS}$. Left directed-

ness here means that $\leq_{\text{LCS}}^{-l} \cap \mathcal{F}^{\times 2}$ is a direction.

For a $\mathbf{K}$ -vector space X , we write $\leq_X = \leq_{\text{LCS}} \cap \mathcal{O}_X^{\times 2}$, when $\mathcal{O}_X$ denotes the set of all $F \in \text{LCS}$ with $\sigma_{rd} F$ a vector substructure of X . For $E, F \in \text{LCS}$, we call E a *topological linear subspace* of F in case we have $E = \leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-inf} \{ G : F \leq G \text{ and } v_s G \subseteq v_s E \}$. Here observe that $\leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-inf} \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{U} \notin \text{LCS}$ in case the greatest lower bound does not exist. We now have

2 Lemma. *For $E, F \in \text{LCS}$ holds $E = F_{/v_s E}$ if and only if E is a topological linear subspace of F .*

Proof. Leaving the simpler " $\Rightarrow$ " case as an exercise to the reader, we show " $\Leftarrow$ ". Thus writing $\mathcal{F} = \{ G : F \leq G \text{ and } v_s G \subseteq v_s E \}$, and letting S be the linear $\sigma_{rd} F$ -span of $(v_s E) \cap (v_s F)$, we have $F_{/S}$ a lower $\leq_{\text{LCS}}$ -bound of $\mathcal{F}$, whence $F_{/S} \leq E$. Consequently, now $S = v_s E$ is a vector subspace of $\sigma_{rd} F$. Then we have $F_{/S} \in \mathcal{F}$, whence $E \leq F_{/S} \leq E$, and hence $E = F_{/S} = F_{/v_s E}$. $\square$

2

Particular function spaces

For our applications of theorems of Section 4, we shall need some locally convex spaces of differentiable functions $Q \rightarrow v_s F$, which we now introduce. We have here $Q \subseteq v_s \Pi$ with $\Pi, F \in \text{LCS}(\mathbf{K})$ and Π finite dimensional. For the function spaces we shall generally use a symbol of the form $S(Q_\Pi, F)$.

If we have a finite sequence $\langle F_0, \dots, F_k \rangle$ with $F_0 = \mathbf{K}$ and $F_k = \Pi$, and each $l \in k^+ \setminus \{0\}$ having some $i, j \in l$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_o$ with $F_l = F_i \sqcap F_j$ or $F_l = F_i^N$, then any nonempty $Q \subseteq v_s \Pi$ uniquely² determines Π . Since $S(\emptyset_\Pi, F)$ does not depend on Π , we then may define $S(Q, F) = S(Q_\Pi, F)$. We put $S(Q) = S(Q, \mathbf{K})$. In case $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{R}$, we put $S(Q)_c = S(Q, \mathbf{C}_\mathbf{R})$, where $\mathbf{C}_\mathbf{R} = (a_c, c_c \mid (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{C}), \tau_c)$ is the topological field $\mathbf{C}$ considered as a real topological vector space.

1 Continuous functions. We put $C(Q_\Pi, F) = (X, \mathcal{T})$, where X is the vector substructure of $(\sigma_{rd} F)^Q$ with underlying set formed by the functions x continuous $\tau_{rd} \Pi \rightarrow \tau_{rd} F$, and $\mathcal{T}$ is the compact-open topology. The space $E = C_{bd}(Q_\Pi, F)$ is defined analogously with the following deviations: In addition to be continuous, for x to belong to $v_s E$, we require $\text{rng } x \in \mathcal{B}_s F$. As a zero basis for $\tau_{rd} E$ we take the filter basis $\{ N(V) : V \in \mathcal{N}_o F \}$, where $N(V) = \{ x \in v_s E : \text{rng } x \subseteq V \}$. We write $C.(Q_\Pi, F)$ for the closed topological linear subspace of $C_{bd}(Q_\Pi, F)$ formed by the functions x which "vanish far away", this meaning that every $V \in \mathcal{N}_o F$ has some $(\tau_{rd} \Pi) \cap Q$ -compact K with $x[Q \setminus K] \subseteq V$. We have the implication

$$E \in \{ C_{bd}(Q_\Pi, F), C.(Q_\Pi, F) \} \text{ and } F \in \text{BaS} \Rightarrow E \in \text{BaS}.$$

In case Q is $\tau_{rd} \Pi$ -compact, we trivially have $C.(Q_\Pi, F) = C_{bd}(Q_\Pi, F)$.

2 Variations. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_o$ and a vector map $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f)$ adapting [AS; pp. 206, 229], we have the first and k^{th} order *variation* maps $\delta \tilde{f} = (E \sqcap E, F, \delta f)$ and $\delta^k \tilde{f} = (E^{k+1}, F, \delta^k f)$, where the variation functions $\delta f = \delta_{EF} f$ and $\delta^k f = \delta_{EF}^k f$

²assuming $\mathbb{K}$ is constructed so that $1. = \{\emptyset\} \notin \mathbb{K}$.

are defined as follows. For $u \in v_s E$, we define the *directional derivative* $d_u f$ by

$$d_u f(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-1}(f(x + t u) - f(x))$$

with the understanding that we have $x \in \text{dom}(d_u f)$ exactly in case $x \in \text{dom} f$ and 0 is a limit point of $\{t \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\} : x + t u \in \text{dom} f\}$ and the previous limit exists w.r.t. the topologies $\tau_{\mathbb{K}}$ and $\tau_{rd} F$. For $\mathbf{u} \in (v_s E)^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}_o$, we then define $d(\mathbf{u})f$ by the recursion $d(\emptyset)f = f$ and $d(\mathbf{u} \hat{\langle} u \rangle)f = d_u(d(\mathbf{u})f)$. Finally we put $\delta^k f(\langle x \rangle \hat{\mathbf{u}}) = (d(\mathbf{u})f)(x)$ and $\delta f \hat{\langle} x, u \rangle = \delta^1 f \hat{\langle} x, u \rangle$ with the understanding that we have $\langle x \rangle \hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \text{dom}(\delta^k f)$ iff $\mathbf{u} \in (v_s E)^k$ and $x \in \text{dom}(d(\mathbf{u})f)$. One sees that $\langle x \rangle \hat{(k \times \{\mathbf{0}_E\})} \in \text{dom}(\delta^k f)$ for any $x \in \text{dom} f$.

In case $\Pi = \mathbf{K}^k$ with standard basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$, where we hence have $e_{l+1} = \{(l, 1)\} \cup ((k \setminus \{l\}) \times \{0\})$, we define the *partial derivatives* $\partial_j f$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$, sometimes taking $j = 0, \dots, k-1$, equivalently written $j \in k$, and $\partial^\alpha f$ for every $\alpha = \langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \rangle \in \mathbb{N}_o^k$ by $\partial_j f = d_{e_j} f$ and $\partial^\alpha f = d(\mathbf{u})f$, where we have taken $\mathbf{u} = (\alpha_1 \times \{e_1\}) \hat{\dots} (\alpha_k \times \{e_k\})$. We write $|\alpha| = \sum_{\nu=1}^k \alpha_\nu$, the *order* of α .

We shall need these variations (or directional derivatives) in the following section for general $E \in \text{LCS}$, but here mainly for finite dimensional ones when constructing the following spaces of

3 Differentiable functions. Putting the restriction $Q \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} O$, where we write $O = \text{Int}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} Q$, for a function $f \in (v_s F)^Q$ and for any $\mathbf{u} \in (v_s \Pi)^k$, we define the extended iterated directional derivative $\bar{d}(\mathbf{u})f$ by $(\bar{d}(\mathbf{u})f)(x) = (d(\mathbf{u})f)(x)$ for $x \in P = O \cap (\text{dom}(d(\mathbf{u})f))$, and by $(\bar{d}(\mathbf{u})f)(x) = \lim_{v \rightarrow x} (d(\mathbf{u})f|_O)(v)$ for $x \in Q \setminus P$ in case a (unique) limit exists. Agreeing that $\infty + 1 = \infty$, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_o \cup \{\infty\}$, we then define

$$C^i(Q_\Pi, F) = \leq_{\text{LCS}} \text{-inf} \{ G : C(Q_\Pi, F) \leq G \text{ and } \forall k, \mathbf{u} ; k \in \mathbb{N}_o \text{ and } \mathbf{u} \in (v_s \Pi)^k \text{ and } k < i + 1 \Rightarrow \bar{d}_G(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{L}(G, C(Q_\Pi, F)) \},$$

where $\bar{d}_G(\mathbf{u}) = \{(f, g) : f \in v_s G \text{ and } g = \bar{d}(\mathbf{u})f\}$.

We let $\mathcal{D}_K(Q_\Pi, F)$ be the topological linear subspace of $C^\infty(Q_\Pi, F)$ formed by the x having $\text{supp } x = \text{Cl}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi}(x^{-\iota}[(v_s F) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}_F\}]) \subseteq K$. Then we put $\mathcal{D}(Q_\Pi, F) = C_0^\infty(Q_\Pi, F) = \leq_{\text{LCS}} \text{-inf} \{ \mathcal{D}_K(Q_\Pi, F) : K \text{ is } (\tau_{rd} \Pi) \cap Q \text{-compact} \}$. Still let

$$C_{bd}^i(Q_\Pi, F) = \leq_{\text{LCS}} \text{-inf} \{ G : C_{bd}(Q_\Pi, F) \leq G \text{ and } \forall k, \mathbf{u} ; k \in \mathbb{N}_o \text{ and } \mathbf{u} \in (v_s \Pi)^k \text{ and } k < i + 1 \Rightarrow \bar{d}_G(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{L}(G, C_{bd}(Q_\Pi, F)) \}.$$

In case $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{C}$ and $\Omega \in \tau_{rd} \Pi$, we write $C^1(\Omega_\Pi, F) = H(\Omega_\Pi, F)$, and further let $H_b(Q_\Pi, F) = G$ be the topological linear subspace of $C^0(Q_\Pi, F) = E$ with $v_s G = \{x \in v_s E : x|_\Omega \in v_s H(\Omega_\Pi, F)\}$, where $\Omega = \text{Int}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} Q$. If Q is $\tau_{rd} \Pi$ -compact, we have the implication $F \in \text{BaS}(\mathbf{C}) \Rightarrow H_b(Q_\Pi, F) \in \text{BaS}(\mathbf{C})$. The vectors of $H(\Omega_\Pi, F)$ are called *holomorphic* functions $\Pi \supseteq \Omega \rightarrow F$.

4 Remarks. Our method above of defining the spaces of differentiable functions as certain locally convex greatest lower bounds is only a means of stating the definitions concisely, still precisely. Apriori, it is not at all clear that for example $E = C^i(Q_\Pi, F)$ even is a topological vector space, or that $E \in \text{LCS}(\mathbf{K})$.

According to our definitions, it is perfectly possible for $E = \mathbf{U}$ to hold, and to prevent this, a proof is required. There one proceeds in the manner which

one usually puts as part of the definition (thus mixing definitions, propositions, and their proofs). Namely, one first specifies a suitable set $S \subseteq (v_s F)^Q$ and a prospective filter basis $\mathcal{V}$ for the neighborhoods at $Q \times \{\mathbf{0}_F\}$, then constructs the topology $\mathcal{T}$ for S by translations of $\mathcal{V}$, and finally puts $E = (((\sigma_{rd} F)^Q)_{|S}, \mathcal{T})$. It then remains to prove that indeed E is the required $\leq_{\text{LCS}}$ -infimum. The standard details we leave as exercises for the mathematically matured reader.

Under our basic assumption $Q \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi}(\text{Int}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} Q)$ which suffices for the unique definition of the extended directional derivatives at boundary points, not even the space $E = C(Q)$ generally needs to be Fréchet, i.e., the neighborhood filter $\mathcal{N}_o E$ does not need to have a countable base. To give an example, with $\xi = (0, 0)$ we take $Q = \{\xi\} \cup]0, 1[^{\times 2}$, hence $\Pi = \mathbf{R} \sqcap \mathbf{R}$ and $F = \mathbf{R}$. Supposing $\mathcal{N}_o E$ has a countable base, there exists a sequence $\langle K_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_o \rangle$ of compact subsets of Q such that every compact $K \subseteq Q$ has some n with $K \subseteq K_n$. Then we construct a sequence $\mathbf{s} = \langle (s_n, (n+1)^{-1}) : n \in \mathbb{N}_o \rangle \rightarrow \xi$ in top $\tau_{rd} \Pi$ with $\mathbf{s} \cdot n \in Q \setminus K_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_o$. Taking $K = \{\xi\} \cup (\text{rng } \mathbf{s})$, a contradiction follows.

A more specific result is the following: Let the real Banach space F be at least one dimensional, and let $Q = O \cup B$ where $O \in \tau_{rd} \Pi$ and $B \subseteq C = \partial_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} O$. Then $C^i(Q_\Pi, F)$ is Fréchet $\Leftrightarrow B \in (\tau_{rd} \Pi) \cap C$, i.e., the set B is open in the relative topology of the boundary C of the open set O .

We also mention the following subtlety in the previous definitions. If we had chosen $P = \text{dom}(d(\mathbf{u})f)$ when defining $\bar{d}(\mathbf{u})f$, the resulting spaces $C^i(Q_\Pi, F)$ would have had smaller underlying set, and generally not even the normable spaces $C^1(Q)$ for compact Q would have been complete, hence Banach. A counterexample can be constructed for $Q = \{0\} \cup \bigcup \{I_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, where with $x_n = 2^{-n}$ we take $I_n = [x_n, x_n + x_n^2]$. One considers the Cauchy sequence $\mathbf{f} = \langle f_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_o \rangle$ with $f_i = \{(0, 0)\} \cup \bigcup \{\langle x - x_n + \varepsilon_{in} : x \in I_n \rangle : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $\varepsilon_{in} = (-1)^n(i+1)^{-1}x_n$.

For $f \in v_s C^i(Q_\Pi, F)$ and a boundary point x of Q , we need not have the equality $d(\mathbf{u})f(x) = \bar{d}(\mathbf{u})f(x)$ even if both sides are defined with $\text{dom } \mathbf{u} \subseteq i$. An example for the previous Q is $f = \tau_{rd} C^1(Q) - \lim \mathbf{f}$ having

$$d(\langle 1 \rangle)f(0) = d_1 f(0) = f'(0) = 0 \neq 1 = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f'(x) = \bar{d}(\langle 1 \rangle)f(0).$$

Although we have above assumed $\dim_{\text{H}} \Pi \in \mathbb{N}_o$, i.e., that Π has finite Hamel dimension, our definitions for the spaces of differentiable functions are meaningful also for $\dim_{\text{H}} \Pi \notin \mathbb{N}_o$. However, if we have $Q \subseteq \text{Cl}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi}(\text{Int}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} Q)$ and $\dim_{\text{H}} \Pi \notin \mathbb{N}_o$, then $f = Q \times \{\mathbf{0}_F\}$ is the only continuous $f : Q \rightarrow v_s F$ with compact support, whence the spaces $\mathcal{D}_K(Q_\Pi, F)$ and $\mathcal{D}(Q_\Pi, F)$ are trivial.

For $E = C^i(\Omega_\Pi, F)$ in the case where we have $\dim_{\text{H}} \Pi \notin \mathbb{N}_o$ and $\Omega \in \tau_{rd} \Pi$, that is $Q = \Omega$ open in Π , there arises the question about the relation of the set $v_s E$ to e.g. the differentiability classes occurring in [Ke]. In the second simplest case $i = 1$, $= \{\emptyset\}$, one might first ask the following

? *Question.* Suppose we only know that f and $d_u f$ are defined on Ω and continuous $\tau_{rd} \Pi \rightarrow \tau_{rd} F$ for every fixed $u \in v_s \Pi$. Does it then follow that the function $f'(x) = \langle d_u f(x) : u \in v_s \Pi \rangle$ is continuous $\tau_{rd} \Pi \rightarrow \tau_{rd} F$ for each fixed $x \in \Omega$?

A proof similar to the one for $w = \mathbf{0}_F$ in the proof of Theorem 3.5 below would

show that $f'(x)$ is linear $\sigma_{rd} \Pi \rightarrow \sigma_{rd} F$, whence in the case of a positive answer to Question ?, we would have $\text{rng } f' \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\Pi, F)$. Allowing general i and assuming $f \in v_s E$, the proof of [Ke; Thm. 2.4.0, p. 90] shows that $d^l f(x) = \langle (d(u)f) \cdot x : u \in (v_s \Pi)^l \rangle$ is symmetric $(v_s \Pi)^l \rightarrow v_s F$ for all fixed $l \in i + 1$ and $x \in \Omega$.

If we put the assumption that Π is *metrizable and barrelled*, e.g., metrizable (locally convex) Baire, Fréchet, or Banach, the Banach–Steinhaus theorem [Jr; Thm. 11.1.3, p. 220] then inductively would show (cf. [Jr; Thm. 5.1.4, p. 89]) that $d^l f(x)$ is a continuous multilinear map $\Pi^l \rightarrow F$ for all $l \in i + 1$ and $x \in \Omega$. Even more, the variation $\delta^l f$ is continuous $\tau_{rd} \Pi^{l+1} \rightarrow \tau_{rd} F$, whence writing $C_c^i(\Omega; \Pi, F) = (C_c^{i\sim} \{(\Pi, F)\}) \cap (v_s F)^\Omega = \{f : (\Pi, F, f) \in C_c^i \text{ and } \text{dom } f = \Omega\}$, see the three lines paragraph just before Proposition 3.4 below, *we would get $v_s E = C_c^i(\Omega; \Pi, F)$ in the case where a positive answer to Question ? exists, and we have Π metrizable and barrelled.*

Observe that for $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{C}$ a positive answer to Question ? is obtained from the discussion just after formula (d) in the proof of Theorem 3.8 below. For real scalars, we trivially have a positive answer if $\tau_{rd} \Pi$ is the strongest locally convex topology for $\sigma_{rd} \Pi$. Then also Π is barrelled by [Jr; Prop. 11.3.1(b), p. 223] since it is linearly homeomorphic to the locally convex direct sum, or coproduct $\coprod_{\text{LCS}} (\alpha \times \{\mathbf{R}\})$ where $\alpha = \dim_{\mathbf{H}} \Pi$. However, it is metrizable only if $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

An example with Π real and normable, but not even barrelled, where we have a negative answer to Question ? can be constructed as follows. Assuming $1 < p \leq +\infty$, we take $F = \mathbf{R}$ and $\Pi = (X, \mathcal{T})$ where $X = \coprod_{\text{VS}} (\mathbb{N}_0 \times \{\mathbf{R}\})$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is the topology induced from $\ell^p(\mathbb{N}_0)$. With $\varphi = \langle s(1 + s^2)^{-1} : s \in \mathbb{R} \rangle$, we define $f(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{-n} \varphi(2^n x_n)$ for $x = \langle x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \rangle \in v_s \Pi$. One easily verifies that we have f and $d_u f : x \mapsto \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \varphi'(2^n x_n) u_n$ continuous $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \tau_{\mathbf{R}}$ for every $u = \langle u_n \rangle \in v_s \Pi$. We see that $f'(\mathbf{0}_\Pi) \notin \mathcal{L}(\Pi, F)$ from $f'(\mathbf{0}_\Pi)u = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} u_n$ by considering $u = \langle (n+1)^{-1} : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle \cup ((\mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \mathbb{N}) \times \{0\})$ with $N \rightarrow \infty$.

A positive answer to Question ? for real scalars is obtained if we assume that $\Pi \in \text{LCS}$ is Baire, e.g., a Fréchet space. Indeed, fixing $x \in \Omega$, and for an arbitrary continuous seminorm ν for F considering the function

$$\varphi = \langle \sup \{ \nu(n(f \cdot z - f \cdot x)) : z = x + n^{-1}u \in \Omega \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \} : u \in v_s \Pi \rangle,$$

one first proves $(\varphi^{-\iota})^\sim [n, +\infty[\in \tau_{rd} \Pi$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. The Baire assumption then gives $\text{Int}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} ((\varphi^{-\iota})^\sim [0, n]) \neq \emptyset$ for some n . It follows that $f'(x)[U] \subseteq (\nu^{-\iota})^\sim [0, 1[$ holds for some $U \in \mathcal{N}_o \Pi$, whence the conclusion. From our discussion above we further get $v_s C^i(\Omega_\Pi, F) = C_c^i(\Omega; \Pi, F)$ for any $\Pi, F \in \text{LCS}(\mathbf{R})$ and $\Omega \in \tau_{rd} \Pi$ with Π metrizable Baire.

5 Examples. (a) Let $\Pi, E \in \text{BaS}(\mathbf{R})$ be such that Π is finite dimensional, and let $Q = \bigcup (\text{rng } \kappa)$, where $\kappa = \langle K_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \rangle$ is increasing, and K_i is $\tau_{rd} \Pi$ -compact with $K_i = \text{Cl}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} (\text{Int}_{\tau_{rd} \Pi} K_i)$ for $i \in I_1 = \mathbb{N}_0$. Assume that every $(\tau_{rd} \Pi) \cap Q$ -compact K has some i with $K \subseteq K_i$. Then we write $F = C^\infty(Q_\Pi, E)$ and $F_i = C^i((K_i)_\Pi, E)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. With $\Delta = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } i \leq j\}$, we also let $\rho_{ij} = \langle y | K_i : y \in v_s F_j \rangle$ and $\rho_i = \langle y | K_i : y \in v_s F \rangle$ for $(i, j) \in \Delta$. Then the projective system $\{(i, j; F_j, F_i, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$ has limit $\langle (F, F_i, \rho_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \rangle$. The space F is Fréchet, and each F_i is Banach. In case κ is constant, we have

$\rho_{ij} \cup \rho_i \subseteq \text{id}$ for $(i, j) \in \Delta$, and then $F = \leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-sup} \{F_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_o\}$.

(b) Let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{F} \subseteq \text{dom}(\leq_X)$ for some $\mathbf{K}$ -vector space X , and let S be a vector subspace of X . If now $G = \leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-sup} \mathcal{F}$, then $G/S = \leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-sup} \{F/S : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. If also $\mathcal{F}$ is right $\leq_{\text{LCS}}$ -directed, i.e., we have $\Delta = \leq_{\text{LCS}} \cap \mathcal{F}^{\times 2}$ a direction, then $\{(F_1, F_2; F_2, F_1, \text{id}_V F_2) : (F_1, F_2) \in \Delta\}$ is an LCS projective system with limit $\langle (G, F, \text{id}_V G) : F \in \mathcal{F} \rangle$. For example, in (a) we might have $Q = K_i = [0, 1]$ and $\Pi = E = \mathbf{R}$, and $X = \mathbf{R}^Q$ with $S = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^Q : x \cdot 0 = 0\}$
or $S = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^Q : x \cdot 0 = x \cdot 1 = 0\}$.

(c) We have $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}) = \leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-sup} \{F_m : m \in \mathcal{M}\}$, when the Banach spaces F_m are defined as follows. We write $I_n = \mathbf{R} \setminus [-n, n]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and put $I_0 = \mathbf{R}$. Letting $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of increasing sequences $m = \langle i_n \rangle : \mathbb{N}_o \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, for $m \in \mathcal{M}$, we let B_m be the set of all functions $x : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_o$ we have $x|_{I_n} \in v_s C^{i_n}(I_n)$ and $i_n |x^{(i)}(s)| \leq 1$ for all $i \in i_n^+$ and all $s \in I_n$. We now let F_m be the unique topological vector space such that $\sigma_{rd} F_m$ is a vector substructure of $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{R}}$ and $B_m \in (\mathcal{N}_o F_m) \cap (\mathcal{B}_s F_m)$. Then $F_m \in \text{BaS}(\mathbf{R})$ with B_m the closed unit ball for the norm $v_s F_m \ni x \mapsto \|x\|_m = \inf \{t \in \mathbf{R}^+ : t^{-1}x \in B_m\}$.

The description of a filter basis for $\mathcal{N}_o \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R})$ given in [Ho; Exa. 2.12.7, pp. 170–171] should serve as a hint for the reader to finding a proof of the assertion that $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}) = \leq_{\text{LCS}}\text{-sup} \{F_m : m \in \mathcal{M}\}$ holds.

Alternatively, we could have defined the spaces F_m by first constructing the sets B_m as follows. We let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all functions $m = \langle i_n \rangle : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and we write $I_n =]n, n+2[$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $m \in \mathcal{M}$, we then let B_m be the set of all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{R}}$ such that $x|_{I_n} \in v_s C^{i_n}(I_n)$ and $i_n |x^{(i)}(s)| \leq 1$ hold for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $i \in i_n^+$ and $s \in I_n$.

Most of our later examples concern maps which are particular cases of

6 Example. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}_o \cup \{\infty\}$, and let $\Pi, \Pi_1, \Pi_2 \in \text{LCS}(\mathbf{R})$ be finite dimensional. Let $Q \subseteq v_s \Pi$ be as specified in paragraph 3 above. Writing $Q^0 = Q \times (v_s \Pi_1)$ and $\Pi_0 = \Pi \sqcap \Pi_1$, let $O \in (\tau_{rd} \Pi_0) \cap Q^0$ be such that $\text{dom}(Q^0 \setminus O)$ is relatively $(\tau_{rd} \Pi) \cap Q$ -compact (intuitively: the "hole" in O projected on Q should be relatively compact). Then defining $E = C^\infty(O_{\Pi_0}, \Pi_2)$ and $F_1 = C^i(Q_{\Pi}, \Pi_1)$ and $F_2 = C^i(Q_{\Pi}, \Pi_2)$, we are interested in the map $\tilde{f} = (E \sqcap F_1, F_2, f)$, where

$$f = \{(x, y, z) : x \in v_s E \text{ and } y \in v_s F_1 \text{ and } z = x \circ [\text{id}, y] \in v_s F_2\}.$$

The "hard part" of the proof of Theorem 3.6 below is contained in

7 Lemma. *In Example 6, whenever $(x, y) \in \text{dom } f, h \in v_s F_1, W \in \mathcal{N}_o F_2$, there are U, V with $U \times V \in \mathcal{N}_o(E \sqcap F_1)$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for all $(u, v) \in U \times V$ and $0 < |t| < \delta$ hold the following*

- (1) $u \circ [\text{id}, y + v] \in W$,
- (2) $x \circ [\text{id}, y + v] - x \circ [\text{id}, y] \in W$,
- (3) $t^{-1}(x \circ [\text{id}, y + th] - x \circ [\text{id}, y]) - \partial_2 x \circ [\text{id}, y] \cdot h \in W$, where $\partial_2 x = \{(\eta, \xi, p) : (\eta, \xi) \in O \text{ and } p = \langle \delta_{\Pi_1 \Pi_2}(x(\eta, \cdot))(\xi, \zeta) : \zeta \in v_s \Pi_1 \rangle\}$.

Proof. Fixing a norm in each space Π, Π_1, Π_2 , a basis of the filter $\mathcal{N}_o F_1$ is $\{N_1(K, \varepsilon) : K \text{ is } (\tau_{rd} \Pi) \cap Q\text{-compact and } \varepsilon > 0\}$, when we let

$$N_1(K, \varepsilon) = \{ y \in v_s F_1 : \forall k, \boldsymbol{\eta}; k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } k < i + 1 \\ \text{and } k\varepsilon < 1 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\eta} \in (\bar{B}_\Pi(1))^k \Rightarrow (\bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta})y) \smallfrown K \subseteq B_{\Pi_1}(\varepsilon) \},$$

and similar characterizations hold for E and F_2 .

If we have $(x, y, z) \in f$, then $z = x \circ [\text{id}, y] \in v_s C^i(Q_\Pi, \Pi_2)$, whence $\text{dom } z = Q = \text{dom } y$, and so $y = \text{rng } [\text{id}, y] \subseteq \text{dom } x = O$. Conversely, we have $w \in \text{dom } f$ for any $w = (x_1, y_1) \in v_s(E \sqcap F_1)$ with $y_1 \subseteq O$. Now $\text{dom } (Q^0 \setminus O) \subseteq K_0$ for some compact $K_0 \subseteq Q$. Then so is $y|_{K_0} \subseteq O$. A standard argument gives some $\varepsilon_0 \in]0, 1[$ such that $(y + v)|_{K_0} \subseteq O$ for all $v \in N_1(K_0, 2\varepsilon_0)$. But then we have also $y + v \subseteq O$, whence $(x_1, y + v) \in \text{dom } f$ for every $x_1 \in v_s E$. Keeping this result in mind, below we tacitly assume $K_0 \subseteq K$ and $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Recall the rule for change of order of differentiation when the (partial) derivatives are continuous, theorem of H. A. Schwarz, which already was implicitly used in the symmetry proof of [Ke; Thm. 2.4.0, p. 90]. Using this, for each fixed $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in (v_s \Pi)^k$ with $k \in i + 1$, a recursion on $l \in k = \text{dom } \boldsymbol{\eta}$ in conjunction with an associated inductive proof shows existence of a finite function $S = S_1(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ with the following properties

- (a) For every $\pi \in S$ there are a bijection $\sigma : k \rightarrow k$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and finite sequences $\boldsymbol{\eta}^0$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}^1 = \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_1}^1 \rangle$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}^2 = \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^2, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_2}^2 \rangle$, where further each $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j^l$ is a finite sequence, and such that we have $\pi = (\tau, n) = (\boldsymbol{\eta}^0, \boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2, n)$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 \hat{\sim} \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^1 \hat{\sim} \dots \hat{\sim} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_1}^1 \hat{\sim} \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^2 \hat{\sim} \dots \hat{\sim} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_2}^2 = \boldsymbol{\eta} \circ \sigma$. Hence we then here have $\tau = (\boldsymbol{\eta}^0, \boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2) \in \text{dom } S = D_1(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ with $n = S \smallfrown \tau = N_\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We also have the estimate $\sum_{\tau \in D_1(\boldsymbol{\eta})} N_\tau = \sum S_1(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \leq (k + 1)^k$.

- (b) If for τ as above and $i_0 = i_1 + i_2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} P_\tau(y, v) &= [\bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^1)y, \dots, \bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_1}^1)y, \bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^2)v, \dots, \bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i_2}^2)v], & \text{we write} \\ t_\tau(u; y, v) &= (\partial_2^{i_0} \bar{d}_1(\boldsymbol{\eta}^0)u) \circ [\text{id}, y + v] \cdot P_\tau(y, v), & \text{where further} \\ \partial_2^l \bar{d}_1(\boldsymbol{\eta}^0)u &= \partial_2^l (\bar{d}_1(\boldsymbol{\eta}^0)u) & \text{with} \\ \bar{d}_1(\boldsymbol{\eta}^0)u &= \{ (\eta, \xi, (\bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^0)(u(\cdot, \xi))) \smallfrown \eta) : (\eta, \xi) \in O \} & \text{and} \\ \partial_2^l \bar{u} &= \{ (\eta, \xi, \ell) : (\eta, \xi) \in O \text{ and} \\ & \quad \ell = \langle (d(\boldsymbol{\xi})(\bar{u}(\eta, \cdot))) \smallfrown \xi : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in (v_s \Pi_1)^l \rangle \}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{then } \bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta})(u \circ [\text{id}, y + v]) = \sum_{\tau \in D_1(\boldsymbol{\eta})} N_\tau t_\tau(u; y, v)$$

holds for any $u \in v_s E$ and $y, v \in v_s F_1$ with $y + v \subseteq O$.

Observe that for example in the case where $\tau = (\boldsymbol{\eta}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ we above have $N_\tau = 1$ and $t_\tau(u; y, v) = (\partial_2^0 \bar{d}_1(\boldsymbol{\eta})u) \circ [\text{id}, y + v] \cdot \emptyset_Q = (\bar{d}_1(\boldsymbol{\eta})u) \circ [\text{id}, y + v]$.

Now to prove (1), fixing y and W , we have some compact K and $\varepsilon > 0$ with $N_2(K, \varepsilon) \subseteq W$. Putting $V = N_1(K, \varepsilon)$, there is some $(\tau_{rd} \Pi_0) \cap O$ -compact K_1 with $(y + v)|_K \subseteq K_1$ for all $v \in V$. Taking $U = N(K_1, M^{-\varepsilon^{-1}} N^{-1} \varepsilon)$, where with $N = \bigcup \{ (B_\Pi(1))^k : k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } k < i + 1 \text{ and } k\varepsilon < 1 \}$ we have $M = \sup \{ 1 + |(\bar{d}(\boldsymbol{\eta})y) \smallfrown \eta|_1 : \boldsymbol{\eta} \in N \text{ and } \eta \in K \}$ and $N = \sup \{ \sum S_1(\boldsymbol{\eta}) : \boldsymbol{\eta} \in N \}$, by a computation left to the reader, we obtain $\{ u \circ [\text{id}, y + v] : (u, v) \in U \times V \} \subseteq N_2(K, \varepsilon) \subseteq W$, hence (1).

For (2) fixing x, y, W with $N_2(K, \varepsilon) \subseteq W$, we consider Riemann integration of continuous curves from $I = [0, 1]$ to the (generally) nonnormable locally convex space $\Pi_2^Q \leq F_2$. For $v \in N_1(K_0, \varepsilon)$, taking $\bar{v} = \langle \partial_2 x \circ [\text{id}, y + s v] : v : s \in I \rangle$ we

may write $x \circ [\text{id}, y + v] - x \circ [\text{id}, y] = \int_I \bar{v}$. For any $\eta \in (v_s \Pi)^k$ with $k \in i + 1$ and $\eta \in K \subseteq Q$ writing $\check{v} = \check{v}(\eta, \eta) = \langle \bar{d}(\eta)(\bar{v}(s)) \backslash \eta : s \in I \rangle$, by classical results we have $\bar{d}(\eta)(\int_I \bar{v}) \backslash \eta = \int_I \check{v}$, where the latter integral is for a curve in Π_2 .

Since $\check{v}$ is continuous, in order to have $\int_I \check{v} \in B_{\Pi_2}(\varepsilon)$, it suffices to establish $\text{rng } \check{v} \subseteq B_{\Pi_2}(\varepsilon)$. Altogether, we see that for the proof of (2) it suffices to find V with $V_2 = \{ \bar{v}(s) : v \in V \text{ and } 0 \leq s \leq 1 \} \subseteq N_2(K, \varepsilon)$.

Defining $x_2(\eta, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \partial_2 x(\eta, y(\eta) + \xi_1) \xi_2$, we have $\bar{v}(s) = x_2 \circ [\text{id}, s v, v]$ and observe that $x_2(\eta, \xi_1, \cdot)$ is linear. A deduction (left to the reader) similar to the one used to establish (a) and (b) above shows that we may write $\bar{d}(\eta)(\bar{v}(s)) = \sum_{\tau \in D_2(\eta)} s^\tau N_\tau^2(\partial_2^l \bar{d}_1(\eta_0) x_2) \circ [\text{id}, s v, \bar{d}(\eta^0) v] \cdot [\bar{d}(\eta^1) v, \dots, \bar{d}(\eta^l) v]$.

Consequently $V_2 \subseteq N_2(K, \varepsilon)$ follows for $V = N_1(K, M^{-1} N^{-1} \varepsilon)$, when taking N as before, and $P = \bigcup \{ (B_{\Pi \cap \Pi_1 \cap \Pi_1}(1))^k : k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } k < i + 1 \text{ and } k \varepsilon < 1 \}$, we put $N = \sup \{ \sum S_2(\eta) : \eta \in N \}$ and

$$M = \sup \{ 1 + |(\bar{d}(\zeta) x_2)(\eta, \xi_1, \xi_2)|_2 : \zeta \in P \text{ and}$$

$$\eta \in K \text{ and } |\xi_1|_1 \leq \varepsilon_0 \text{ and } |\xi_2|_1 \leq 1 \}. \quad \text{The norm}$$

we are using for $\Pi \cap \Pi_1 \cap \Pi_1$ is $(\eta, \xi_1, \xi_2) \mapsto \sup \{ |\eta|, |\xi_1|_1, |\xi_2|_1 \}$.

To prove (3), we first observe that the expression which should be got in W , can be written $x_1 \circ [\text{id}, y_1 + t h] - x_1 \circ [\text{id}, y_1]$, when we take $y_1 = \mathbf{0}_{F_1}$ and define

$$x_1(\eta, \xi) = \int_0^1 (\partial_2 x(\eta, y(\eta) + s \xi) - \partial_2 x(\eta, y(\eta))) (h(\eta)) ds.$$

Noticing that (2) requires only derivatives of $x(\cdot, \xi)$ of order less than $i + 1$, we can apply (2) with $x = x_1$ and $y = y_1$ and $v = t h$. This gives (3). $\square$

3 Differentiability in general dimensions

We shall use the classes C^k of order k continuous differentiabilitys of [Hi1] "pulled back" to LCS, which are exactly the Keller classes C_Π^k of [Ke]. Put precisely, we have $C_\Pi^k = \{ \tilde{f} : \tilde{f} \text{ vector map (of l.c.s.) and } \lambda_{\text{tv}} \tilde{f} \in C^k \}$, when $\lambda_{\text{tv}}(E, F, f) = (\lambda_{\text{tv}} E, \lambda_{\text{tv}} F, f)$ with $\lambda_{\text{tv}}(X, \mathcal{T}) = (X, \Lambda)$, where in turn Λ is the convergence (= limit structure) corresponding to the topology $\mathcal{T}$. Hence we have $(x, \mathcal{F}) \in \Lambda$ iff $x \in T = \bigcup \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is a filter on T with $\{ V : \exists U \in \mathcal{T} ; x \in U \subseteq V \subseteq T \} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

For a map $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f)$ we may also write $f : E \supseteq U \rightarrow F$ when $U = \text{dom } f$. We say $\tilde{f}$ *smooth* iff $\tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^\infty$ holds. We remark that although in [Ke] only real scalars have been considered, Keller's definitions and results relevant for us are equally valid for $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{C}$. We shall write $C_\Pi^k = C_\Pi^k(\mathbf{K})$ in case we want to stress the coefficient field.

We say that $\tilde{f}$ is *almost Gateaux differentiable* (or *directionally differentiable*, or has directional derivatives) iff $\text{dom}(\delta_{EF} f) = (\text{dom } f) \times (v_s E)$. With complex scalars assuming that F is Mackey complete (see [KM; p. 15, Lemma 2.2]) we then say that $\tilde{f}$ is *holomorphic*, and write $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{H}_T$ in case it is directionally differentiable and $\tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^0(\mathbf{C})$ holds. By [KM; p. 81, Thm. 7.4, (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)], directional differentiability follows if the function $t \mapsto \ell(f(x + t u))$ is an ordinary holomorphic function $\{ t : x + t u \in \text{dom } f \} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ for any $x \in \text{dom } f$ and $u \in v_s E$ and $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(F, \mathbf{C})$. In case also E is Fréchet, our concept of holomorphy equals [KM;

p. 83, Def. 7.8], see [KM; p. 88, Thm. 7.19, (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3)], cf. also [Pi; p. 183 (T)].

The higher order *differential* functions $d_{EF}^k f = d^k f$ of map $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f)$ we define as follows. Letting Ω be the set all x with $\{\langle x \rangle^{\mathbf{u}} : \mathbf{u} \in (v_s E)^k\} \subseteq \text{dom}(\delta^k f)$, and such that the function $\mathbf{u} \mapsto \delta^k f(\langle x \rangle^{\mathbf{u}})$ is multilinear $(\sigma_{rd} E)^k \rightarrow \sigma_{rd} F$, we put $d^k f = \langle \langle \delta^k f(\langle x \rangle^{\mathbf{u}}) : \mathbf{u} \in (v_s E)^k \rangle : x \in \Omega \rangle$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ and a vector map $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f)$ with $E, F \in \text{LCS}$ and $\Omega = \text{dom } f \in \tau_{rd} E$, we now have $\tilde{f} \in C_{\Pi}^k$ iff $\text{dom}(d^i f) = \Omega$ and $\text{rng}(d^i f) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^i(E, F)$, set of continuous multilinear maps, hold for all $i < k + 1$, and further we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall l < k + 1, x \in \Omega, W \in \mathcal{N}_o F; \exists U \in \mathcal{N}_o E; \\ & \forall \varepsilon > 0; \exists V \in \mathcal{N}_o E; \forall v \in V; (d^l f(x + v) - d^l f(x))[U^l] \subseteq \varepsilon W. \quad (\pi) \end{aligned}$$

The condition (π) is an explicit expression for $d^l f$ to be $\lim$ -continuous $\tau_{rd}(\lambda_{\mathbf{tv}} E) \rightarrow \tau_{rd} \mathcal{L}_{\Pi}^l(E, F)$, see [Ke; p. 40, Prop. 0.5.1 and p. 45, Thm. 0.5.12].

1 Proposition. *If $(E, F, f) \in C_{\Pi}^k$ and F_1 is a sequentially closed topological linear subspace of F , then the implication $\text{rng } f \subseteq v_s F_1 \Rightarrow (E, F_1, f) \in C_{\Pi}^k$ holds.*

Proof. First using sequential closedness and induction on $l < k + 1$, we prove $\text{rng}(\delta^l f) \subseteq v_s F_1$, and then apply (π) . $\square$

2 Definition. For a vector map $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f)$, we say that $\mathcal{F}$ is a *projective extension* of $\tilde{f}$ via $\mathcal{R}$ iff we here have functions $\mathcal{R} = \{(i, j; \rho_{ij}^1, \rho_{ij}^2) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \langle (E_i, F_i, f_i; \rho_i^1, \rho_i^2) : i \in I_1 \rangle$, where $I_1 = \text{dom } \Delta$, and $\langle (F, F_i, \rho_i^2) : i \in I_1 \rangle$ is an LCS projective limit of $\{(i, j; F_j, F_i, \rho_{ij}^2) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$, and

- (1) $\rho_i^1 \in \mathcal{L}(E, E_i)$ and ρ_{ij}^1 linear $\sigma_{rd} E_j \rightarrow \sigma_{rd} E_i$ and (E_i, F_i, f_i) a vector map
- (2) $\rho_i^1 = \rho_{ij}^1 \circ \rho_j^1$ and $\rho_i^2 \circ f = f_i \circ \rho_i^1$ and $\rho_{ij}^2 \circ f_j = f_i \circ \rho_{ij}^1$

hold for all $(i, j) \in \Delta$. We call $\mathcal{F}$ a projective extension of $\tilde{f}$ iff it is such via some $\mathcal{R}$, and we speak of a projective C_{Π}^k -extension in case $\text{rng } \mathcal{F} \subseteq C_{\Pi}^k$ holds.

Observe that the projective limit assumption implicitly contains the requirements $\rho_{ik}^2 = \rho_{ij}^2 \circ \rho_{jk}^2$ and $\rho_i^2 = \rho_{ij}^2 \circ \rho_j^2$ for $(i, j), (j, k) \in \Delta$. One also observes that if in (2) we drop $\rho_i^2 \circ f = f_i \circ \rho_i^1$, the remaining two equalities already guarantee existence of a unique f with (2). Conversely, if instead of $\rho_{ij}^2 \circ f_j = f_i \circ \rho_{ij}^1$, we take surjectivity $\text{rng } \rho_i^1 = v_s E_i$, then again (2) holds.

3 Theorem. *If $\tilde{f}$ has a projective C_{Π}^k -extension, then $\tilde{f} \in C_{\Pi}^k$.*

Proof. With the notations of Definition 2, let $\mathcal{F}$ be a projective C_{Π}^k -extension of $\tilde{f}$ via $\mathcal{R}$. We shall show $\tilde{f} \in C_{\Pi}^k$. By induction on l , the reader easily verifies $\rho_{ij}^2 \circ (\delta^l f_j) = (\delta^l f_i) \circ X(l^+ \times \{\rho_{ij}^1\})$. By induction on l , we next show $\rho_i^2 \circ (\delta^l f) = (\delta^l f_i) \circ X(l^+ \times \{\rho_i^1\})$ for all $i \in I_1$. Since each $d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x)$ is multilinear, this implies that so is $d^l f(x)$ too. Here $l \in k + 1$.

The case $l = 0$ being our assumption, let the assertion hold for a fixed $l < k$. To prove it for $l + 1$, we fix $x \in \text{dom } f$ and $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}^{\wedge} \langle h \rangle = \langle u_1 \dots u_l, h \rangle \in (v_s E)^{l+1}$, and consider $\Delta(t) = t^{-1}(d^l f(x + th) - d^l f(x))\mathbf{u}$. We must find some $y \in v_s F$ with $\tau_{rd} F - \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \Delta(t) = y$ and $\rho_i^2 y = y_i = d^{l+1} f_i(\rho_i^1 x)(\rho_i^1 \circ \mathbf{w})$ for all i .

We have $\rho_{ij}^2 y_j = y_i$ for all $(i, j) \in \Delta$, whence there is a unique y with $\rho_i^2 y = y_i$.

To prove $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \Delta(t) = y$, arbitrarily picking $W \in \mathcal{N}_o F$, we have some $i \in I_1$ with $W_i \in \mathcal{N}_o F_i$ and $(\rho_i^2)^{-\iota}[W_i] \subseteq W$. Then there is some $\delta > 0$ with $\Delta^i(t) - y_i = t^{-1}(d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x + t \rho_i^1 h)(\rho_i^1 \circ \mathbf{u}) - d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x)(\rho_i^1 \circ \mathbf{u})) - y_i \in W_i$ for $0 < |t| < \delta$. By the inductive assumption, we have $\rho_i^2(\Delta(t)) = \Delta^i(t)$, whence for $0 < |t| < \delta$, we obtain $\Delta(t) - y \in (\rho_i^2)^{-\iota}[W_i] \subseteq W$, and the induction is completed.

To show that the multilinear map $d^l f(x)$ is continuous, let $W \in \mathcal{N}_o F$. There is some $i \in I_1$ with $W_i \in \mathcal{N}_o F_i$ and $(\rho_i^2)^{-\iota}[W_i] \subseteq W$. Since $d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x)$ is continuous, we have some $U_i \in \mathcal{N}_o E_i$ with $d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x)[U_i^l] \subseteq W_i$. Then $U = (\rho_i^1)^{-\iota}[U_i] \in \mathcal{N}_o E$, and to prove $d^l f(x)[U^l] \subseteq W$, arbitrarily picking $\mathbf{u} \in U^l$, it suffices to have $\rho_i^2(d^l f(x)(\mathbf{u})) \in W_i$. This indeed holds, since $\rho_i^1 \circ \mathbf{u} \in U_i^l$, whence we obtain $\rho_i^2(d^l f(x)(\mathbf{u})) = d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x)(\rho_i^1 \circ \mathbf{u}) \in W_i$.

Now, to prove $\tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^k$, we verify (π) for it. Fixing $l < k+1$ and $x \in \text{dom } f$ and $W \in \mathcal{N}_o F$, we find some $W_i \in \mathcal{N}_o F_i$ with $(\rho_i^2)^{-\iota}[W_i] \subseteq W$. Then applying (π) to the map (E_i, F_i, f_i) , we take a corresponding $U_i \in \mathcal{N}_o E_i$, and put $U = (\rho_i^1)^{-\iota}[U_i]$. Next we fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and still using (π) take a corresponding $V_i \in \mathcal{N}_o E_i$, and put $V = (\rho_i^1)^{-\iota}[V_i]$. For $v \in V$ fixed, to prove $(d^l f(x+v) - d^l f(x))[U^l] \subseteq \varepsilon W$, arbitrarily picking $\mathbf{u} \in U^l$, it suffices to show $\rho_i^2((d^l f(x+v) - d^l f(x))\mathbf{u}) \in \varepsilon W_i$. This holds, since $\rho_i^1 v \in V_i$ and $\rho_i^1 \circ \mathbf{u} \in U_i^l$, whence $\rho_i^2((d^l f(x+v) - d^l f(x))\mathbf{u}) = (d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x + \rho_i^1 v) - d^l f_i(\rho_i^1 x))(\rho_i^1 \circ \mathbf{u}) \in \varepsilon W_i$. $\square$

The Keller class C_c^k for $k \in \mathbb{N}_o \cup \{\infty\}$ has as members exactly the maps $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f) \in C_\Pi^0$ with $\text{dom } f = \text{dom } (d_{EF}^i f)$ and $\delta^i \tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^0$ for all $i < k+1$. From [Ke; p. 99, Prop. 2.7.1] we obtain

4 Proposition. *The equality $C_c^\infty = C_\Pi^\infty$ is valid.*

We write $\tilde{g} \circ \tilde{f} = (E, G, g \circ f)$ for vector maps $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f)$ and $\tilde{g} = (F, G, g)$. With the class $\mathcal{L}$ of continuous linear maps of locally convex spaces, note $\mathcal{L} \subseteq C_\Pi^\infty$ for the applications of the following

5 Theorem. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq C_\Pi^0$ be such that every $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}$ is almost Gateaux differentiable and has some $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{C}$ and some $\tilde{h} \in C_c^\infty$ with $\delta \tilde{f} = \tilde{g} \circ \tilde{h}$. Then $\mathcal{C} \subseteq C_\Pi^\infty$.*

Proof. If we have $(*) \quad \{\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C} : \delta \tilde{f} \in C_c^k\} \subseteq C_c^{k+1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_o$, using the chain rule for C_c^k , a trivial induction gives $\mathcal{C} \subseteq C_c^k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_o$, hence $\mathcal{C} \subseteq C_\Pi^\infty$ by Proposition 4. Thus it suffices to prove $(*)$ by induction on $k \in \mathbb{N}_o$.

To prove $(*)$ for $k = 0$, let $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\delta \tilde{f} \in C_c^0 = C_\Pi^0$. Since we have $\mathcal{C} \subseteq C_\Pi^0$, and $\delta f(x, tu) = t \delta f(x, u)$ for all $x \in \text{dom } f$ and $u \in v_s E$ and $t \in \mathbb{K}$, to obtain $\text{dom } (d^1 f) = \text{dom } f$, it suffices for fixed $x \in \text{dom } f$ and $u, v \in v_s E$ to prove $w = \delta f(x, u+v) - \delta f(x, u) - \delta f(x, v) = \mathbf{0}_F$.

To proceed via reductio ad absurdum, assuming $w \neq \mathbf{0}_F$, by Hahn–Banach, we have some $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(F, \mathbb{K})$ with $\text{Re}(\ell w) = 1$. Then putting $g = \ell \circ f$, by continuity of δf , we have some $\delta > 0$ with $\text{Re}(\delta g(x + tu + sv, v) - \delta g(x, v)) < \frac{1}{2}$ for $0 < t, s < \delta$. By the definition of δf , we further have some $t \in]0, \delta[$ with $\alpha = \text{Re}(t^{-1}(g(x + tu) - g(x)) - \delta g(x, u) - t^{-1}(g(x + t(u+v)) - g(x)) + \delta g(x, u+v)) < \frac{1}{2}$. By the mean value theorem of classical differential calculus, we have some $s \in]0, t[$ with $t^{-1} \text{Re}(g(x + t(u+v)) - g(x + tu)) = \text{Re}(\delta g(x + tu + sv, v))$.

Then we get $1 = \operatorname{Re}(\ell w) = \operatorname{Re}(\delta g(x, u + v) - \delta g(x, u) - \delta g(x, v))$
 $= \alpha + \operatorname{Re}(t^{-1}(g(x + t(u + v)) - g(x + tu)) - \delta g(x, v))$
 $= \alpha + \operatorname{Re}(\delta g(x + tu + sv, v) - \delta g(x, v)) < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1$, a contradiction.

Now assuming $(*)$ for a fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, to prove it for $k + 1$, let $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\delta \tilde{f} \in C_c^{k+1}$. By $C_c^{k+1} \subseteq C_c^k$ and the inductive assumption, we then have $\tilde{f} \in C_c^{k+1}$. Hence to prove $\tilde{f} \in C_c^{k+2}$, it suffices to show $\operatorname{dom}(d^{k+2}f) = \operatorname{dom} f$ and $\delta^{k+2}\tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^0$. Writing $\delta^l(\delta \tilde{f}) = ((E^2)^{l+1}, F, \delta^l f_1)$, by induction on $l \in k^{++}$, we see

$$\delta^l f_1 \langle (x_0, x_1), (x_2, \mathbf{0}_E), \dots, (x_{l+1}, \mathbf{0}_E) \rangle = \delta^{l+1} f \langle x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{l+1} \rangle$$

for all $\langle x_i \rangle \in v_s E^{l+2}$ with $x_0 \in \operatorname{dom} f$. Taking $l = k + 1$, we immediately obtain $\delta^{k+2}\tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^0$, and also see that each function $x_i \mapsto \delta^{l+1} f \langle x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{l+1} \rangle$ is linear $\sigma_{rd} E \rightarrow \sigma_{rd} F$ for $i = 2, \dots, l + 1$. Linearity with respect to x_1 is easily seen to hold by induction on l , and then we are done. $\square$

6 Theorem. *The membership $(E \sqcap F_1, F_2, f) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ holds in Example 2.6.*

Proof. Keeping Q, Π, Π_2 fixed, we let P be the class of all pairs $\pi = (\Pi_1, O)$ such that all this data is as we have assumed in Example 2.6. Then denoting by $\tilde{f}_\pi$ the corresponding map, we define $\mathcal{C} = \{\tilde{f}_\pi : \pi \in P\}$. Applying Theorem 5, it now suffices to show that $\tilde{f}_\pi$ is continuous with open domain and almost Gateaux differentiable, and that we can write $\delta \tilde{f}_\pi = \tilde{f}_{\pi_1} \circ \tilde{\ell}$ for some $\pi_1 \in P$ and $\tilde{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}$.

Continuity, openness, and directional differentiability follow by a simple deduction from Lemma 2.7, as does $\delta f(x, y; u, v) = u \circ [\operatorname{id}, y] + \partial_2 x \circ [\operatorname{id}, y] \cdot v$. Defining $p(\eta; \xi_1, \xi_2) = (\eta, \xi_1)$ and $d_2 x(\eta; \xi_1, \xi_2) = \partial_2 x(\eta, \xi_1) \xi_2$, and writing $\Pi_3 = \Pi \sqcap (\Pi_1 \sqcap \Pi_2)$, and with $O^1 = \{(\eta; \xi_1, \xi_2) : (\eta, \xi_1) \in O \text{ and } \xi_2 \in v_s \Pi_1\}$ further putting $\pi_1 = (\Pi_1 \sqcap \Pi_2, O^1)$, we have a continuous linear map

$$\tilde{\ell} = ((E \sqcap F_1) \sqcap (E \sqcap F_1), C^\infty(O_{\Pi_3}^1, \Pi_2) \sqcap C^i(Q_\Pi, \Pi_1 \sqcap \Pi_2), \ell)$$

defined by $(x, y; u, v) \mapsto (u \circ p + d_2 x, [y, v])$. A straightforward deduction shows that we now have $\delta \tilde{f}_\pi = \tilde{f}_{\pi_1} \circ \tilde{\ell}$. $\square$

7 Remarks. From Theorem 6, one almost directly obtains several particular results as *corollaries* by simple observations. For example, we have the following.

(a) With $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\Pi = \Pi_1 = \Pi_2 = \mathbf{R}$, let $Q = I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a compact interval, and put $O = I \times \mathbb{R}$. Fixing a smooth $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider $g : G = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \sqcap F \rightarrow F = C^i(I)$ given by $(x, y) \mapsto x - \varphi \circ y$, where we understand $\operatorname{dom} g = v_s G$ and $\operatorname{dom}(u - v) = (\operatorname{dom} u) \cap (\operatorname{dom} v)$. The map $p : G \rightarrow E \sqcap F$ given by $(x, y) \mapsto (\bar{x}, y)$, where $\bar{x}(\eta, \xi) = x(\eta) - \varphi(\xi)$, is a sum of a continuous linear and constant map, hence smooth. Since we have $g = f \circ p$, from Theorem 6 in conjunction with the chain rule [Hi1; Prop. 0.11, p. 240], we obtain $(G, F, g) \in C_\Pi^\infty$.

(b) Now that we have Theorem 6 available, to retrieve the variation formula

$$(v) \quad \delta f(x, y; u, v) = u \circ [\operatorname{id}, y] + \partial_2 x \circ [\operatorname{id}, y] \cdot v,$$

we do not any longer have to make a recourse to Lemma 2.7 since we can argue as follows. Fixing x, y, u, v , for $t \neq 0$ such that $(x + tu, y + tv) \in \operatorname{dom} f$, define $\Delta(t) = t^{-1}(f(x + tu, y + tv) - f(x, y))$. From Theorem 6, we know that the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \Delta(t) = \delta f(x, y; u, v)$ exists as a vector in the space F_2 . Since a continuous linear map $\operatorname{ev}_\eta : F_2 \rightarrow \Pi_2$ is defined by $y \mapsto y(\eta)$, we can compute the li-

mit "pointwise" as an exercise in finite dimensions

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta f(x, y; u, v)(\eta) &= \text{ev}_\eta(\delta f(x, y; u, v)) = \text{ev}_\eta(\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \Delta(t)) \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_\eta(\Delta(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \Delta(t)(\eta) \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-1}((x + tu)(\eta, (y + tv)(\eta)) - x(\eta, y(\eta))) \\
&= u(\eta, y(\eta)) + \partial_2 x(\eta, y(\eta))(v(\eta)) \\
&= (u \circ [\text{id}, y] + \partial_2 x \circ [\text{id}, y] \cdot v)(\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for every $\eta \in Q$, we get (v). In particular for partial derivatives, we get $\partial_2 f(x, y)v = \delta f(x, y; \mathbf{0}_E, v) = \partial_2 x \circ [\text{id}, y] \cdot v$. Similarly, using induction on $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one derives the higher order variation formula

$$\delta^k f(\mathbf{z}) = \partial_2^k x \circ [\text{id}, y] \cdot \bar{v} + \sum_{j=1}^k \partial_2^{k-1} u_j \circ [\text{id}, y] \cdot \bar{v}_j,$$

where $\mathbf{z} = \langle (x, y), (u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_k, v_k) \rangle$, and we have written $\bar{v} = [v_1, \dots, v_k]$ and $\bar{v}_j = [v_1, \dots, v_{j-1}, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_k]$.

(c) In the proofs of Theorems 5.2 and 5.4 below, we need some information of the map $\tilde{f}_1 = (E \sqcap C^{i+1}(I), F_2, f_1)$, where with $\Pi = \Pi_2 = \mathbf{R}$ and $\Pi_1 = \mathbf{R} \sqcap \mathbf{R}$, we have $Q = I = [0, 1]$, and E and F_2 are as in Example 2.6, and

$$f_1 = \{(\varphi, y, z) : \varphi \in v_s E \text{ and } y \in v_s C^{i+1}(I) \text{ and } z = \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] \in v_s F_2\}.$$

We then have $\tilde{f}_1 \in C_\Pi^\infty$, and the formula

$$\partial_2 f_1(\varphi, y)v = \partial_2 \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] \cdot v + \partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] \cdot v'$$

holds for $(\varphi, y) \in \text{dom } f_1$ and $v \in v_s C^{i+1}(I)$, when labelling anew the partial derivatives so that if $\partial_\Pi \varphi$ denotes the original $\partial_2 \varphi$ with values in $\mathcal{L}(\Pi_1, \mathbf{R})$, the functions $\partial_2 \varphi$ and $\partial_3 \varphi$ are defined by $\xi = (\eta; \xi_1, \xi_2) \mapsto \partial_\Pi \varphi(\xi)(1, 0)$ and $\xi \mapsto \partial_\Pi \varphi(\xi)(0, 1)$, respectively. For the proof, we note that $f_1 = f \circ (\text{id} \times_\mathbb{2} \ell)$, where f is as in Example 2.6, and the continuous linear $\ell : C^{i+1}(I) \rightarrow F_1$ is given by $y \mapsto [y, y']$. Then we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_2 f_1(\varphi, y)v &= \delta f_1(\varphi, y; \mathbf{0}_E, v) = \delta f(\varphi, \ell y; \mathbf{0}_E, \ell v) \\
&= \partial_\Pi \varphi \circ [\text{id}, \ell y] \cdot (\ell v) = \partial_\Pi \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] \cdot [v, v'] \\
&= \partial_2 \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] \cdot v + \partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] \cdot v'.
\end{aligned}$$

8 Theorem. *The inclusion $\mathcal{H}_T \subseteq C_\Pi^\infty(\mathbf{C})$ is in force.*

Proof. To apply Theorem 5, it suffices to verify that every $\tilde{f} = (E, F, f) \in \mathcal{H}_T$ has $\delta \tilde{f} \in \mathcal{H}_T$. This we show using the Cauchy-formula, for which we introduce the following particular weak integral concept. For a (continuous) function $\gamma : \{\zeta \in \mathbf{C} : |\zeta| = 1\} \rightarrow v_s F$, we write $\oint \gamma(\zeta) d\zeta = v$ iff $v \in v_s F$ and in the sense of Riemann-integration, we have $\int_0^1 \ell(\gamma(e^{2\pi i s})) e^{2\pi i s} ds = \ell v$ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(F, \mathbf{C})$.

Now fix $\tilde{f}$. If $x \in \text{dom } f$ and $u \in v_s E$ are such that $D_2 = \{\zeta \in \mathbf{C} : |\zeta| < 2\} \subseteq \{t : x + tu \in \text{dom } f\}$, for any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(F, \mathbf{C})$, we have $t \mapsto \ell(f(x + tu))$ holomorphic $D_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ in the ordinary sense. Hence the ordinary Cauchy formula gives

$$(c) \quad f(x + tu) = \oint (\zeta - t)^{-1} f(x + \zeta u) d\zeta \text{ for } |t| < 1,$$

whence again composing with ℓ , and then differentiating with respect to t , where we recall that f is continuous, we obtain

$$(d) \quad \delta f(x, u) = \oint \zeta^{-2} f(x + \zeta u) d\zeta.$$

A Hahn-Banach argument shows that if $\text{rng } \gamma \subseteq V \in \mathcal{N}_o F$ with V closed and

absolutely convex, then also $\oint \gamma(\zeta) d\zeta \in V$. Using this, continuity of f and (d) show that every $x \in \text{dom } f$ has some $U \in \mathcal{N}_o E$ with $\delta f|((x+U) \times U)$ continuous. Then using $\delta f(x, u) = t^{-1} \delta f(x, tu)$ with $t \neq 0$, we obtain $\delta \tilde{f} \in C_{\Pi}^0$.

To prove that $\delta \tilde{f}$ is almost Gateaux-differentiable, fixing x, u, u_1, u_2 and ℓ , it suffices to show that we have an ordinary holomorphic function φ given by

$$\begin{aligned} t \mapsto \ell(\delta f(x + t u_1, u + t u_2)) &= \oint \zeta^{-2} \ell(f(x + t u_1 + \zeta(u + t u_2))) d\zeta \\ &= \oint \oint \zeta^{-2} (\zeta_1 - t)^{-1} \ell(f(x + \zeta_1 u_1 + \zeta(u + \zeta_1 u_2))) d\zeta_1 d\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

where we obtained the last expression by using (c) with u replaced by $u_1 + \zeta u_2$. Since we assume f continuous, differentiability of φ is a standard fact of finite dimensional analysis, as in the deduction of (d). We are done. $\square$

9 Example. With $D(r) = \{\eta \in \mathcal{C} : |\eta| < r\}$ and $\bar{D}(r) = \{\eta \in \mathcal{C} : |\eta| \leq r\}$, let $\Omega = D(1) \times \mathcal{C}$. Hence taking $\mathbf{K} = \mathcal{C}$, and fixing $0 < r < 1$, then $E = H(\Omega)$ is Fréchet, and $F = H_b(\bar{D}(r))$ is a Banach space. Noting that the topologies of both spaces E, F require only uniform boundedness (on compacta) of the functions themselves, and no derivatives are involved, using the principles of the proof of Lemma 2.7, the reader may easily show that $(E \sqcap F, F, f) \in \mathcal{H}_T \subseteq C_{\Pi}^{\infty}(\mathcal{C})$ holds for the function f defined by $v_s(E \sqcap F) \ni (x, y) \mapsto x \circ [\text{id}, y]$.

4 Implicit and inverse function theorems

If we have a continuous function g between subsets of some topological spaces with $(x, y) \in g \subseteq W$ and W open in the product topology, then we can choose open sets U and V with $(x, y) \in U \times V \subseteq W$ and $g[U] \subseteq V$. Hence also taking into account [Hi1; p. 244, Lemma 1.3(1)], we see that an equivalent formulation of the *implicit function theorem* in [Hi1; p. 235] is the following

1 Theorem. *Let $\tilde{f} = (E \sqcap F, F, f) \in C_{\Pi}^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and F a Banach space. If $(z, b) \in f$ with $\partial_2 f(z)$ bijective $v_s F \rightarrow v_s F$, there is some W satisfying $z \in W \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap F)$ and $(E, F, f^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W) \in C_{\Pi}^k$, and such that also $\partial_2 f(w)$ is bijective $v_s F \rightarrow v_s F$ for all $w \in W$.*

2 Definition. For a vector map $\tilde{f} = (E \sqcap F, F, f)$, we say that $\mathcal{F}$ is a Bp_2 -extension of $\tilde{f}$ by $\mathcal{R}$ iff we here have functions $\mathcal{R} = \{(i, j, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \langle (F_i, f_i, \rho_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle$, where $I_1 = \text{dom } \Delta$, such that $\langle (F, F_i, \rho_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle$ is an LCS projective limit of $\{(i, j; F_j, F_i, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$, and for all $i \in I_1$ we have F_i a Banachable space together with $\rho_i \circ f \subseteq f_i \circ (\text{id} \times \rho_i)$.

Assuming we can obtain existence of an implicit function, its differentiability may be guaranteed using the following

3 Theorem. *Let $\langle (F_i, f_i, \rho_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle$ be a Bp_2 -extension of $(E \sqcap F, F, f)$ by $\{(i, j, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$, and let $b \in v_s F$. If $\{(E \sqcap F_i, F_i, f_i) : i \in I_1\} \subseteq C_{\Pi}^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, and if (1) and (2) below hold, then $(E, F, g) \in C_{\Pi}^k$.*

(1) $g = f^{-\iota}[\{b\}]$ and $\forall i \in I_1$;

$$g_i = f_i^{-\iota}[\{\rho_i b\}] \text{ is a function and } \text{dom } g_i \subseteq \text{dom } g,$$

(2) $\forall i, x, y; i \in I_1$ and $(x, y, b) \in f \Rightarrow \partial_2 f_i(x, \rho_i y)$ is bijective $v_s F_i \rightarrow v_s F_i$.

Proof. Using Theorem 3.3, it suffices to construct some $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathcal{G}$ is a projective C_Π^k -extension of (E, F, g) via $\mathcal{R}$. Let us show that we may take $\mathcal{G} = \langle (E, F_i, g_i; \text{id}_v E, \rho_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{ (i, j; \text{id}_v E, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta \}$. To check the conditions of Theorem 3.3 and Definition 3.2, we must show that g is a function with $g_i = \rho_i \circ g$, and that $(E, F_i, g_i) \in C_\Pi^k$ holds for all $i \in I_1$.

As each g_i is a function by (1), for all $i \in I_1$ and all x, y, z , we have the implications $(x, y), (x, z) \in g \Rightarrow (x, y, b), (x, z, b) \in f \Rightarrow (x, \rho_i y, \rho_i b), (x, \rho_i z, \rho_i b) \in f_i \Rightarrow (x, \rho_i y), (x, \rho_i z) \in g_i \Rightarrow \rho_i y = \rho_i z$. This immediately gives $\rho_i \circ g \subseteq g_i$, and since by the projective limit property, we have $[\forall i; \rho_i y = \rho_i z] \Rightarrow y = z$, also g is a function. By $\text{dom } g_i \subseteq \text{dom } g$, we further obtain $g_i = \rho_i \circ g$.

To prove $(E, F_i, g_i) \in C_\Pi^k$, arbitrarily picking $w = (x, z) \in g_i$, it suffices to have some h with $w \in h \subseteq g_i$ and $(E, F_i, h) \in C_\Pi^k$. Using $g_i = \rho_i \circ g$, we see that there is some y with $(x, y, b) \in f$ and $(y, z) \in \rho_i$, whence Theorem 1 in conjunction with assumption (2) gives us the required $h = g_i \cap W$. $\square$

To exemplify the different conditions of Theorem 3, we modify a classical example, and consider

Example. We let $\Delta = \{ (i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \text{ and } i \leq j \}$ and $\epsilon = \langle e^s : s \in \mathbb{R} \rangle$. Writing $I_i = [-i, i]$, we now put $E = F = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $F_i = C^i(I_i)$, and define $f = \{ (x, y, x - \epsilon \circ y) : x, y \in v_s E \}$ and $f_i = \{ (x, y, x - \epsilon \circ y) : x \in v_s E \text{ and } y \in v_s F_i \}$. Then we take $b = \mathbf{0}_F = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$ and $k = \infty$, and $\rho_{ij} = \{ (y, y|I_i) : y \in v_s F_j \}$ and $\rho_i = \{ (y, y|I_i) : y \in v_s F \}$.

From Remarks 3.7, we know $(E \sqcap F_i, F_i, f_i) \in C_\Pi^\infty$, and $\partial_2 f_i(\epsilon \circ y, y|I_i) v = \epsilon \circ y \cdot v$ when $y \in v_s E$ and $v \in v_s F_i$. We also have $\text{dom } g_i = \{ x \in v_s E : x|I_i \} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+ \not\subseteq \{ x \in v_s E : \text{rng } x \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+ \} = \text{dom } g$. Hence other conditions of Theorem 3 are satisfied, except that in (1) the requirement $\text{dom } g_i \subseteq \text{dom } g$ fails for all i .

4 Definition. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is a $B\partial_2$ -extension of $\tilde{f}$ in C_Π^k by $\mathcal{R}$ around z^0 iff it is a Bp_2 -extension and with the notations of Definition 2 we have some $i_0 \in I_1$ and $W_0 \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap F_{i_0})$ and $z^0 = (x^0, y^0, b) \in f$ and $(x^0, \rho_{i_0} y^0) \in W_0 \subseteq \text{dom } f_{i_0}$ and $\{ (E \sqcap F_i, F_i, f_i) : i \in I_1 \} \subseteq C_\Pi^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, and for $(i_0, j) \in \Delta$ we have $\rho_{i_0 j}$ injective and $\rho_j \circ f = f_j \circ (\text{id} \times \rho_j)$ and $\rho_{i_0 j} \circ f_j = f_{i_0} \circ (\text{id} \times \rho_{i_0 j})$, and

- (1) $\partial_2 f_{i_0}(x^0, \rho_{i_0} y^0)$ is bijective $v_s F_{i_0} \rightarrow v_s F_{i_0}$,
- (2) $\forall x, y, \ell; (x, y, \ell) \in \partial_2 f_j$ and $z = (x, \rho_{i_0 j} y) \in W_0$ and $\partial_2 f_{i_0}(z)$ is bijective $v_s F_{i_0} \rightarrow v_s F_{i_0} \Rightarrow \ell$ is bijective $v_s F_j \rightarrow v_s F_j$,
- (3) $\forall x^1, y^1, \mathbf{y}; (x^1, y^1) \in v_s(E \sqcap F_{i_0})$ and $\mathbf{y} = \langle y_n \rangle \in (v_s F_j)^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $[\forall n \in \mathbb{N}; (n^{-1}x^0 + (1 - n^{-1})x^1, \rho_{i_0 j} y_n, \rho_{i_0} b), (x^1, y^1, \rho_{i_0} b) \in f_{i_0}]$, and $\rho_{i_0 j} \circ \mathbf{y} \rightarrow y^1$ in the topology $\tau_{rd} F_{i_0} \Rightarrow y^1 \in \text{rng } \rho_{i_0 j}$.

We say that $\tilde{f}$ is $B\partial_2$ -extensible in C_Π^k around z^0 iff it has one such extension.

The main part of Theorem 1 is generalized in the following *implicit function*

5 Theorem. If $\tilde{f} = (E \sqcap F, F, f)$ is $B\partial_2$ -extensible in C_Π^k around (z, b) , there is W with $z \in W \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap F)$ and $(E, F, f^{-1}[\{b\}] \cap W) \in C_\Pi^k$.

Proof. With the notations of Definition 4, let $\mathcal{F}$ be a $B\partial_2$ -extension of $\tilde{f}$ in C_{Π}^k by $\mathcal{R}$ around $z^0 = (z, b) = (x^0, y^0, b)$. Applying Theorem 1 to $(E \cap F_{i_0}, F_{i_0}, f_{i_0})$ at $z_2 = (x^0, \rho_{i_0} y^0)$, we obtain some $W_2 \subseteq W_0$ with $z_2 \in W_2 \in \tau_{rd}(E \cap F_{i_0})$ and $(E, F_{i_0}, g_0) \in C_{\Pi}^k$, when $g_0 = f_{i_0}^{-\iota}[\{\rho_{i_0} b\}] \cap W_2$. In addition, we have $\partial_2 f_{i_0}(w)$ bijective $v_s F_{i_0} \rightarrow v_s F_{i_0}$ for $w \in W_2$. Then we take any $U \in \tau_{rd} E$ with $x^0 \in U \subseteq \text{dom } g_0$ and $U - x^0$ circled, and further put $W = (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_{i_0})^{-\iota}[W_2] \cup U$. We now have $z \in W \in \tau_{rd}(E \cap F)$, and writing $g = f^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W$, it remains to prove that also $\tilde{g} = (E, F, g) \in C_{\Pi}^k$ holds.

Writing $I_2 = \Delta[\{i_0\}]$ and $\Delta^2 = \Delta \cap I_2^{\times 2}$, and further putting $W_j = (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_{i_0 j})^{-\iota}[W_2] \cup U$, we apply Theorem 3 with Δ replaced by Δ^2 and $h_i = f_i|_{W_i}$ in place of f_i and $h = f|_W$ in place of f . To obtain $\tilde{g} \in C_{\Pi}^k$, we must verify conditions (1) and (2), and show $\rho_i \circ h \subseteq h_i \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_i)$ for all $i \in I_2$. For the last one, letting $(x, y, v) \in h$, we must show $(x, y, \rho_i v) \in h_i \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_i)$. By $(x, y) \in W$, we have $(x, \rho_{i_0 i}(\rho_i y)) = (x, \rho_{i_0 i} y) \in W_2$ and $x \in U$, hence $(x, \rho_i y) \in W_i$. Now the conclusion follows from $\rho_i \circ f \subseteq f_i \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_i)$.

Condition $g = h^{-\iota}[\{b\}]$ in (1) means $f^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W = (f|_W)^{-\iota}[\{b\}]$, which is trivial. For $i \in I_2$ fixed, to show that $g_i = h_i^{-\iota}[\{\rho_i b\}]$ is a function, letting $(x, y_{\nu}) \in g_i$ for $\nu = 1, 2$, we have $(x, y_{\nu}, \rho_i b) \in f_i$ with $(x, y_{\nu}) \in W_i$, hence $(x, \rho_{i_0 i} y_{\nu}) \in W_2$, and by $\rho_{i_0 i} \circ f_i \subseteq f_{i_0} \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_{i_0 i})$ also $(x, \rho_{i_0 i} y_{\nu}, \rho_{i_0 i} b) \in f_{i_0}$ holds. Consequently $(x, \rho_{i_0 i} y_{\nu}) \in g_0$, hence $y_1 = y_2$, as g_0 is a function and $\rho_{i_0 i}$ is injective.

To prove $\text{dom } g_i \subseteq \text{dom } g$ in (1), arbitrarily fixing $j \in I_2$, we first show $\text{dom } g_j \in \tau_{rd} E$. Thus letting $(x, y) \in g_j$, we have $(x, y, \rho_j b) \in h_j \subseteq f_j$ with $(x, \rho_{i_0 j} y) \in W_2$. By (2) of Definition 4, we then have $\partial_2 h_j(x, y) = \partial_2 f_j(x, y)$ bijective $v_s F_j \rightarrow v_s F_j$, whence Theorem 1 gives W_1 with $(x, y) \in W_1$ and $(E, F_j, g_j \cap W_1) \in C_{\Pi}^k$. In particular, we have $x \in U_1 = \text{dom}(g_j \cap W_1) \in \tau_{rd} E$ and $U_1 \subseteq \text{dom } g_j$. We have obtained $\text{dom } g_j \in \tau_{rd} E$ since x is arbitrary.

To proceed in the proof of $\text{dom } g_i \subseteq \text{dom } g$, we next show $\text{dom } g_j = U$. Trivially having $\text{dom } g_j \subseteq U$, we fix $x \in U$ and show $x \in \text{dom } g_j$. For this, writing $S = \{s : 0 \leq s \leq 1 \text{ and } \forall r ; 0 \leq r \leq s \Rightarrow (1-r)x^0 + rx \in \text{dom } g_j\}$ and $t = \sup S$, it suffices to show $1 = t \in S$. Note that by $(x^0, y^0, b) \in f$ and $\rho_j \circ f \subseteq f_j \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_j)$, we have $0 \in S$, hence $S \neq \emptyset$ and $t \geq 0$. If we have $t \in S$, then by $\text{dom } g_j \in \tau_{rd} E$, we indirectly see $t = 1$, whence it remains to prove $t \in S$.

To get $t \in S$, we use (3) of Definition 4 with $x^1 = (1-t)x^0 + tx$ and $y^1 = g_0(x^1)$ and $y_n = g_j(x_n)$, where $x_n = n^{-1}x^0 + (1-n^{-1})x^1 \in \text{dom } g_j$. By $\rho_{i_0 j} \circ f_j \subseteq f_{i_0} \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_{i_0 j})$, we then have $(x_n, \rho_{i_0 j} y_n, \rho_{i_0} b) \in f_{i_0}$, and observing $(x_n, \rho_{i_0 j} y_n) \in W_2$, hence also $\rho_{i_0 j} y_n = g_0(x_n)$. Since $(E, F_{i_0}, g_0) \in C_{\Pi}^k$, we have g_0 continuous $\tau_{rd} E \rightarrow \tau_{rd} F_{i_0}$, which gives $\rho_{i_0 j} \circ y \rightarrow y^1$. Now (3) gives existence of some y with $(y, y^1) \in \rho_{i_0 j}$. Then using $\rho_{i_0 j} \circ f_j \supseteq f_{i_0} \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_{i_0 j})$ and injectivity of $\rho_{i_0 j}$, we see $(x^1, y) \in g_j$, hence $x^1 \in \text{dom } g_j$ and $t \in S$.

Now to prove $\text{dom } g_i \subseteq \text{dom } g$, fixing $x \in \text{dom } g_i = U$, we write $y_j = g_j(x)$ for $j \in I_2$. Using $\rho_{i_0 j} \circ f_j \subseteq f_{i_0} \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_{i_0 j})$, we first obtain $y_{i_0} = \rho_{i_0 j} y_j$ for all $j \in I_2$. Then utilizing $\rho_{i_0 l} = \rho_{i_0 j} \circ \rho_{j l}$ and injectivity of $\rho_{i_0 j}$, we get $y_j = \rho_{j l} y_l$ for $(j, l) \in \Delta^2$. Hence there is y with $\{y\} = \bigcap \{\rho_j^{-\iota}[\{y_j\}] : j \in I_2\}$, and to prove $(x, y) \in g$, we must show $(x, y, b) \in f$ and $(x, \rho_{i_0} y) \in W_2$. Using $\rho_j \circ f \supseteq f_j \circ (\text{id} \times_2 \rho_j)$,

we get $(x, y, b) \in f$, and further note $(x, \rho_{i_0} y) = (x, y_{i_0}) \in g_{i_0} \subseteq W_2$.

For (2) assuming $(x, y, b) \in h$, we must show $\partial_2 h_i(x, \rho_i y)$ bijective $v_s F_i \rightarrow v_s F_i$. Using (2) of Definition 4, it suffices to show $w = (x, \rho_{i_0 i}(\rho_i y)) \in W_2$. This indeed holds, since $(x, y) \in W \Rightarrow w = (x, \rho_{i_0} y) \in W_2$. Now all conditions of Theorem 3 are verified, whence we obtain $\tilde{g} \in C_\Pi^k$. $\square$

Let us say that a vector map $\tilde{f} = (E, E, f)$ is *BI-extensible* in C_Π^k about z iff $(E \sqcap E, E, f_1)$ is $B\partial_2$ -extensible in C_Π^k around $(z, \mathbf{0}_E)$, when $f_1 = \{(x, v, u - x) : (v, u) \in f \text{ and } x \in v_s E\}$. We say that $\tilde{f}$ is a local C_Π^k -diffeomorphism $U \rightarrow V$ iff $g = f|U$ is bijective $U \rightarrow V$ with $(E, E, g), (E, E, g^{-\iota}) \in C_\Pi^k$. From Theorem 5, we now obtain an *inverse function theorem* as

6 Corollary. *If $\tilde{f} = (E, E, f)$ is BI-extensible in C_Π^k about z , then some U, V satisfy $z \in V \times U$ with $\tilde{f}$ a local C_Π^k -diffeomorphism $U \rightarrow V$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{f}$ be BI-extensible in C_Π^k about $z = (x_0, y_0)$. Noticing that we have $f_1^{-\iota}[\{\mathbf{0}_E\}] = \{(x, y) : (y, x) \in f\} = f^{-\iota}$, from Theorem 5, we get an open W with $z \in W$ and $(E, E, g_2) \in C_\Pi^k$, where we put $g_2 = f^{-\iota} \cap W$. By continuity of g_2 , we can choose open U_1, V_1 with $z \in V_1 \times U_1 \subseteq W$ and $g_2 \restriction V_1 \subseteq U_1$.

Letting $\langle (E_i, f_{1i}, \rho_i) : i \in I_1 \rangle$ be a $B\partial_2$ -extension of $(E \sqcap E, E, f_1)$ in C_Π^k by $\{(i, j, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$ around $(z, \mathbf{0}_E)$, we define $f_i = f_{1i}(\mathbf{0}_E, \cdot)$. We now have $\rho_i \circ f = f_i \circ \rho_i$ and $\rho_{i_0 j} \circ f_j = f_{i_0} \circ \rho_{i_0 j}$ for $(i_0, j) \in \Delta$. If we had $(*) \rho_{ij} \circ f_j = f_i \circ \rho_{ij}$ for $(i, j) \in \Delta^0 = \Delta|I_0$, where $I_0 = \Delta^0 \setminus \{i_0\}$, then $\langle (E_i, E_i, f_i; \rho_i, \rho_i) : i \in I_0 \rangle$ would be a projective C_Π^k extension of $\tilde{f}$ via $\{(i, j; \rho_{ij}, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta^0\}$, and Theorem 3.3 would give $\tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^k$. To prove this, it thus suffices to obtain $(*)$. Recalling that $\rho_{i_0 i}$ is injective, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{i_0 i} \circ (\rho_{ij} \circ f_j) &= (\rho_{i_0 i} \circ \rho_{ij}) \circ f_j = \rho_{i_0 j} \circ f_j \\ &= f_{i_0} \circ \rho_{i_0 j} = f_{i_0} \circ (\rho_{i_0 i} \circ \rho_{ij}) = (f_{i_0} \circ \rho_{i_0 i}) \circ \rho_{ij} \\ &= (\rho_{i_0 i} \circ f_i) \circ \rho_{ij} = \rho_{i_0 i} \circ (f_i \circ \rho_{ij}) \Rightarrow (*). \end{aligned}$$

Now having $\tilde{f} \in C_\Pi^k$, using continuity of f , we pick an open U with $y_0 \in U \subseteq (\text{dom } f) \cap U_1$ and $V = f \restriction U \subseteq V_1$. Putting $g_1 = g_2|g_2^{-\iota}[U]$ and $f|U = g$, then $z \in V \times U$ and $(E, E, g), (E, E, g_1) \in C_\Pi^k$, and it remains to show $g_1 = g^{-\iota}$.

For $g_1 \subseteq g^{-\iota}$, we first observe that $\text{rng } g_1 \subseteq U$, since g_2 is a function. Hence for $(x, y) \in g_1 \subseteq g_2 \subseteq f^{-\iota}$, we have $y \in U$, whence $(y, x) \in f|U = g$, and $(x, y) \in g^{-\iota}$. Conversely, for $g^{-\iota} \subseteq g_1$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} (x, y) \in g^{-\iota} &\Rightarrow (y, x) \in f|U \Rightarrow (x, y) \in f^{-\iota} \text{ and } y \in U \subseteq U_1 \text{ and } x \in f \restriction U \subseteq V_1 \\ &\Rightarrow y \in U \text{ and } (x, y) \in f^{-\iota} \text{ and } (x, y) \in V_1 \times U_1 \subseteq W \\ &\Rightarrow y \in U \text{ and } (x, y) \in f^{-\iota} \cap W = g_2 \Rightarrow (x, y) \in g_2|g_2^{-\iota}[U] = g_1. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5

Smooth solution maps

Our goal in this section is to give various examples of applications of Theorems 4.1, 4.3, and 4.5 to prove results about smooth dependence of the solution of a nonlinear (partial) differential equation on the data. "Data" here refers not only to initial or boundary conditions, but also to the "nonlinearity" of the equation.

We only want to illustrate the principles of application, and we do not aim at hard results. To be able to give fairly complete proofs within moderate space, we have striven for examples that, say, do not require too "heavy" apriori estimates.

1 Example. We consider the equation $\varphi(s; y(s), y'(s)) = 0$ for $s \in I = [0, 1]$, requiring the initial condition $y(0) = \eta \in \mathbb{R}$. Recalling our basic definitions, we write this equation as $\varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] = I \times \{0\}$. Here we assume $y \in v_s C^1(I)$ and $\varphi : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth for a fixed O , which is open in the natural topology of $I \times (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$, induced from $\tau_{rd}(\mathbf{R} \sqcap (\mathbf{R} \sqcap \mathbf{R}))$.

We put $E = E_0 \sqcap E_1 = \mathbf{R} \sqcap C^\infty(O)$, and denote by F_i the topological linear subspace of $G = C^{i+1}(I)$ with $v_s F_i = \{y \in v_s G : y(0) = 0\}$. The *solution relation* of our equation we call the set Σ of all $w = (x, y) = (\eta, \varphi, y) \in v_s(E \sqcap C^1(I))$ with $\varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y'] = I \times \{0\}$ and $y(0) = \eta$. We let Σ_0 be the set of all *regular* $w \in \Sigma$, this meaning that if we write $p_\iota = \partial_\iota \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y']$ for $\iota = 2, 3$, then $0 \notin \text{rng } p_3$ and every $v \in v_s F_0$ has a unique $u \in v_s F_0$ with $p_3 u' + p_2 u = v'$.

An elementary exercise in ordinary differential equations shows that for w to be regular it suffices just to require $0 \notin \text{rng } p_3$, since the C^1 -solution u to $p_3 u' + p_2 u = v'$ with $u(0) = 0$ is $u = e^{-A} \int_0^t (e^A p_3^{-1} v')$, where $A = \int_0^t (p_3^{-1} p_2)$.

As an application of Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, we now show that for every regular $w \in \Sigma$ there are $U \in \tau_{rd} E$ and $V \in \tau_{rd} C^1(I)$ with $w \in U \times V$, and such that the relation $g = \Sigma \cap (U \times V)$ actually is a function $U \rightarrow v_s C^\infty(I)$ with $(E, C^\infty(I), g)$ a smooth map. Taking into account the three lines at the beginning of Section 4, we see that this is equivalently encoded in the following succinct formulation of

2 Theorem. *For every $w \in \Sigma_0$ there is some W with $w \in W \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap C^1(I))$ and $(E, C^\infty(I), \Sigma \cap W) \in C_\Pi^\infty$.*

Proof. Utilizing the notation $\bar{\eta} = I \times \{\eta\}$, for $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define the maps $\tilde{f}_i = (E \sqcap F_i, F_i, f_i)$ by $f_i(w) = \int_0^t \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y + \bar{\eta}, y']$, thus requiring that $f_i(w)(t) = \int_0^t \varphi(s; \eta + y(s), y'(s)) ds$ must hold for all $t \in I$. Here we take $w = (\eta, \varphi, y) \in v_s(E \sqcap F_i)$ such that $\text{dom}(\varphi \circ [\text{id}; y + \bar{\eta}, y']) = I$, i.e., such that for every $s \in I$, we have $(s; \eta + y(s), y'(s)) \in O$.

We now have the equivalence $(\eta, \varphi, \bar{\eta} + y) \in \Sigma \Leftrightarrow (\eta, \varphi, y) \in f_0^{-1}[\{b\}]$ for all η, φ, y , when $b = I \times \{0\} = \mathbf{0}_{F_i}$. Since $\int_0$ defines a continuous linear map

$C^i(I) \rightarrow F_i$, and $(\eta, y) \mapsto [y + \bar{\eta}, y']$ respectively $\mathbf{R} \sqcap F_i \rightarrow C^i(I, \mathbf{R} \sqcap \mathbf{R})$, the chain rule [Hi1; Prop. 0.11, p. 240] in conjunction with Theorem 3.6 gives us the result $\tilde{f}_i \in C_\Pi^\infty$ for all i .

Fixing $(\eta, \varphi, y) \in \Sigma_0$, we prove $y \in v_s C^\infty(I)$. Since $0 \notin \text{rng } p_3$ holds by regularity, using Theorem 4.1, or even the classical finite dimensional implicit function theorem in its utterly simple form, we see that every $t \in I \setminus \{0, 1\}$ has a smooth ψ_t defined on an open neighborhood of $(t, y(t))$ such that (i) $y'(s) = \psi_t(s, y(s))$ holds for $s \in I$ close to t . Induction then shows that y is smooth on $]0, 1[$. To prove $y \in v_s C^\infty(I)$, it suffices to obtain (i) also for $t = 0, 1$.

Using continuity of the partial derivatives of φ , for each fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we can extend φ to a C^k function $\bar{\varphi}$, for example $\bar{\varphi}(s, \xi) = \sum_{i=0}^k (i!)^{-1} s^i \partial_1^i \varphi(0, \xi)$ when

$s < 0$, with $(0; \eta, y'(0)), (1; y(1), y'(1)) \in \text{dom } \bar{\varphi} \in \tau_{rd}(\mathbf{R} \sqcap (\mathbf{R} \sqcap \mathbf{R}))$. Then an application of the implicit function theorem gives (i) with ψ_t now a C^k function. As above, we deduce $y \in v_s C^k(I)$, and noting that here $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary, then $y \in v_s C^\infty(I)$ immediately follows.

Now preparing ourselves to the application of Theorem 4.3, we let F be the topological linear subspace of $G = C^\infty(I)$ with $v_s F = \{y \in v_s G : y(0) = 0\}$, and further put $\Delta = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{N}_o \text{ and } i \leq j\}$, thus having $I_1 = \mathbb{N}_o$. Also let $\rho_i = \text{id}_v F$ and $\rho_{ij} = \text{id}_v F_j$ for $(i, j) \in \Delta$. Now fixing $w = (\eta, \varphi, y) \in \Sigma_0$, we have $w_0 = (\eta, \varphi, y - \bar{\eta}) \in \Sigma_1$, when Σ_1 is the set of all $w_1 = (\eta_1, \varphi_1, y_1)$ such that $\bar{w}_1 = (\eta_1, \varphi_1, \bar{\eta}_1 + y_1) \in \Sigma_0$.

Using the result $\text{rng } \Sigma_0 \subseteq v_s C^\infty(I)$ from above, we obtain $\Sigma_1 \subseteq \text{dom } f_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_o$. Recalling Remarks 3.7(c), we see that if $w_1 \in \Sigma_1$, then $\partial_2 f_i(w_1) : v_s F_i \rightarrow v_s F_i$ is the function $u \mapsto \int_0 (p_3 u' + p_2 u)$, which for $i = 0$ is bijective by the assumed regularity. Since here $p_i = \partial_i \varphi_1 \circ [\text{id}; \bar{\eta}_1 + y_1, y_1']$ are smooth, a simple induction using $u' = p_3^{-1}(v' - p_2 u)$ shows that bijectivity holds for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_o$.

Applying Theorem 4.1 to $\tilde{f}_0$ at (w_0, b) , we get W_2 with $w_0 \in W_2 \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap F_0)$ and $(E, F_0, f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_2) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ and $\partial_2 f_0(w_1)$ bijective $v_s F_0 \rightarrow v_s F_0$ for $w_1 \in W_2$. We want W_1 with $w_0 \in W_1 \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap F_0)$, and such that $\bar{w}_1$ would be regular for $w_1 \in f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1$. From the preceding, we see that the unique solvability holds for $w_1 \in W_2$. Using continuity of $(s; \eta_1, \varphi_1, y_1) \mapsto \partial_3 \varphi_1(s; \eta_1 + y_1(s), y_1'(s))$ in conjunction with compactness of I , we see that suitably shrinking W_2 to W_1 , we have $\bar{w}_1$ regular for $w_1 \in f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1$. Thus $f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1 \subseteq \Sigma_1$.

Now with $f_{1i} = f_i|_{W_1}$ and $f = \bigcap \{f_{1i} : i \in \mathbb{N}_o\}$, we put $g_i = f_{1i}^{-\iota}[\{b\}]$ and $g = f^{-\iota}[\{b\}]$. Then taking $\tilde{f} = (E \sqcap F, F, f)$, a straightforward verification shows that $\langle (F_i, f_{1i}, \rho_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}_o \rangle$ is a Bp_2 -extension of $\tilde{f}$ by $\{(i, j, \rho_{ij}) : (i, j) \in \Delta\}$. As we have $W_1 \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap F_0)$, also $(E \sqcap F_i, F_i, f_{1i}) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ holds for $i \in \mathbb{N}_o$.

A continuous linear map $\ell : E \sqcap C^1(I) \rightarrow E \sqcap F_0$ is defined by $(\eta_1, \varphi_1, y_1) \mapsto (y_1(0), \varphi_1, \tilde{y}_1)$, where we write $\tilde{y}_1 = y_1 - I \times \{y_1(0)\}$. Hence $W = \ell^{-\iota}[W_1] \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap C^1(I))$. Since $\eta = y(0)$ and $(\eta, \varphi, y - \bar{\eta}) = w_0 \in W_1$, also $w \in W$ holds. We are done once we show $(E, F, g) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ and (x) that $\Sigma \cap W$ is the function $\text{dom } g \ni x_1 = (\eta_1, \varphi_1) \mapsto \bar{\eta}_1 + g(x_1)$.

To prove $(E, F, g) \in C_\Pi^\infty$, it suffices that we verify conditions (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.3. Since by $f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1 \subseteq f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_2$, we have $f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1$ a function, for (1) it suffices to show $g_i \subseteq g_0 \subseteq f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1$ and $g_0 \subseteq g$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_o$. We trivially have $g \subseteq g_i \subseteq g_0$, and $g_0 \subseteq g$ is a simple consequence of $g_0 \subseteq f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1 \subseteq \Sigma_1$ and $\text{rng } \Sigma_1 \subseteq v_s F$. For $g_0 \subseteq f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1$ we only observe $g_0 = f_{10}^{-\iota}[\{b\}] = (f_0|_{W_1})^{-\iota}[\{b\}] = f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1$. Condition (2) follows from what we have already shown when noticing $\rho_i \subseteq \text{id}$, we utilize the implication $(w_1, b) \in f \Rightarrow w_1 \in f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1 \subseteq \Sigma_1$. Theorem 4.3 gives $(E, F, g) \in C_\Pi^\infty$.

To prove (x), for $x_1 = (\eta_1, \varphi_1)$, it suffices to observe that we have

$$(x_1, \bar{\eta}_1 + y_1) \in \Sigma \cap W \Leftrightarrow (x_1, y_1) \in f_0^{-\iota}[\{b\}] \cap W_1 = g. \quad \square$$

If we insisted on expressing the content of Theorem 2 in a language very akin to the standard formalism, we would be lead for example to the following a bit

clumsy formulation: Let $I = [0, 1]$ and let O be open in $I \times \mathbb{R}^2$. Suppose the C^1 function $y_1 : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the smooth $\varphi_1 : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

- (1) $y_1(0) = \eta_1$ and $(s, y_1(s), y_1'(s)) \in O$ and $\varphi_1(s, y_1(s), y_1'(s)) = 0$ for all $s \in I$,
- (2) $\partial_3 \varphi_1(s, y_1(s), y_1'(s)) \neq 0$ for all $s \in I$.

Then there are $\varepsilon > 0$ and an open neighborhood V of φ_1 in $C^\infty(O)$, and a neighborhood V_1 of y_1 in $C^1(I)$ such that for each $x = (\eta, \varphi)$ with $|\eta - \eta_1| < \varepsilon$ and $\varphi \in V$, there is a unique $y \in V_1$ with $y(0) = \eta$ and $(s, y(s), y'(s)) \in O$ and $\varphi(s, y(s), y'(s)) = 0$ for all $s \in I$. This assignment $x \mapsto y$ defines a map

$$\mathbb{R} \times C^\infty(O) \supseteq \{(\eta, \varphi) : |\eta - \eta_1| < \varepsilon \text{ and } \varphi \in V\} \rightarrow C^\infty(I),$$

which is smooth in the Keller C_Π^∞ sense. (Taking into account that the spaces in question are all Fréchet, smoothness then holds also in various other senses, cf. [Hi1; p. 241, Remarks 0.12].)

We refrain from expressing any of our further results in this kind of longish form, thus leaving the possible formulations to the reader if one such wishes. Next modifying Example 1 a little, we consider a boundary value problem.

3 Example. We study $(*) \ y'' = \varphi \circ [\text{id}; y, y']$ with $y(0) = \eta_0$ and $y(1) = \eta_1$ for C^2 functions $y : I = [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Here we assume $\eta = (\eta_0, \eta_1) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, and $\varphi : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth as in Example 1. The solution relation Σ of our present equation is the set of all $w = (x, y) = (\eta, \varphi, y) = (\eta_0, \eta_1, \varphi, y)$ with $(*)$ and $\eta_0, \eta_1, \varphi, y$ as we have just specified.

Now putting $E = \mathbf{R} \sqcap \mathbf{R} \sqcap C^\infty(O)$, and letting F_i be the topological linear subspace of $G = C^{i+2}(I)$ with $v_s F_i = \{y \in v_s G : y(0) = y(1) = 0\}$, we here call $w \in \Sigma$ *regular* iff the equation $u'' - p_3 u' - p_2 u = v''$ has a unique solution $u \in v_s F_0$ for any $v \in v_s F_0$. Letting Σ_0 be the set of all regular w , we prove

4 Theorem. For every $w \in \Sigma_0$ there is some W with $w \in W \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap C^2(I))$ and $(E, C^\infty(I), \Sigma \cap W) \in C_\Pi^\infty$.

Proof. We first observe that $y \mapsto y'' = z$ is a linear homeomorphism $F_0 \rightarrow C(I)$ with inverse $\ell : z \mapsto y$, where $y(s) = z^2(s) - z^2(1)s$ with $z^2(s) = \int_0^s (\int_0^t z) dt$. Also $\ell|_{(v_s C^i(I))} : C^i(I) \rightarrow F_i$ is a linear homeomorphism for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. For $\eta = (\eta_0, \eta_1)$, now defining $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_0 + (\eta_1 - \eta_0)s : s \in I \rangle$, we let $\tilde{f}_{0i} = (E \sqcap F_i, F_i, f_{0i})$, where $f_{0i}(w) = y - \ell(\varphi \circ [\text{id}; y + \bar{\eta}, y' + \bar{\eta}'])$ for $w = (x, y) = (\eta, \varphi, y) = (\eta_0, \eta_1, \varphi, y) \in v_s(E \sqcap F_i)$ such that $\text{rng}[\text{id}; y + \bar{\eta}, y' + \bar{\eta}'] \subseteq O$.

Taking $b = I \times \{0\}$, the equivalence $(\eta, \varphi, \bar{\eta} + y) \in \Sigma \Leftrightarrow (\eta, \varphi, y) \in \tilde{f}_{0i}^{-1}[\{b\}]$ now holds for all η, φ, y , and all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, since an induction based on $(*)$ shows that we have $\text{rng} \Sigma \subseteq C^\infty(I)$. Theorem 3.6 in conjunction with the chain rule³ and $\mathcal{L} \subseteq C_\Pi^\infty$ gives us $\{\tilde{f}_{0i} : i \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \subseteq C_\Pi^\infty$. From Remarks 3.7(c), we obtain $\partial_2 f_{0i}(w)u = u - \ell(p_3 u' + p_2 u)$. We see that $\partial_2 f_{0i}(w) : v_s F_i \rightarrow v_s F_i$ is bijective for $w \in \Sigma_1 = \{(\eta, \varphi, y) : (\eta, \varphi, \bar{\eta} + y) \in \Sigma_0\}$.

Now fixing $w = (\eta_0, \varphi_0, y_0) \in \Sigma_0$, we apply Theorem 4.1 to $\tilde{f}_{00}$ at (w_0, b) for $w_0 = (\eta_0, \varphi_0, y_0 - \bar{\eta}_0)$. We then obtain some W_0 with $w_0 \in W_0 \in \tau_{rd}(E \sqcap F_0)$ and

³ and the fact: $(E, F, f), (E, G, g) \in C_\Pi^k \Rightarrow (E, F \sqcap G, [f, g]) \in C_\Pi^k$, see [Hi1; Prop. 0.10, p. 240]

$(E, F_0, f_{00}^{-1}[\{b\}] \cap W_0) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ and $\partial_2 f_{00}(w_1)$ bijective $v_s F_0 \rightarrow v_s F_0$ for $w_1 \in W_0$. Then we have $g = f_{00}^{-1}[\{b\}] \cap W_0 \subseteq \Sigma_1$, and hence also $\partial_2 f_{0i}(w_1) : v_s F_i \rightarrow v_s F_i$ is bijective for $w_1 \in g$. A continuous linear map $\ell_0 : E \cap C^2(I) \rightarrow E \cap F_0$ is given by $(\eta, \varphi, y) \mapsto (\eta_y, \varphi, y - \bar{\eta}_y)$, where $\eta_y = (y^0, y^1)$. Taking $W = \ell_0^{-1}[W_0]$, we now have $w \in W \in \tau_{rd}(E \cap C^2(I))$, and writing $\tilde{g}_1 = (E, C^\infty(I), \Sigma \cap W)$, we are done once we show $\tilde{g}_1 \in C_\Pi^\infty$.

To prove $\tilde{g}_1 \in C_\Pi^\infty$, we first construct the setting for application of Theorem 4.3. Let F be the topological linear subspace of $G = C^\infty(I)$ with $v_s F = \{y \in v_s G : y^0 = y^1 = 0\}$. We take Δ and I_1 as in the proof of Theorem 2, and also define ρ_i and ρ_{ij} as there. We put $f = \bigcap \{f_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, where $f_i = f_{0i}|_{W_0}$. As before, one verifies the conditions of Theorem 4.3, which then gives us $(E, F, g) \in C_\Pi^\infty$. Now $\tilde{g}_1 \in C_\Pi^\infty$ follows once the reader has verified that the relation $\Sigma \cap W$ is exactly the function $\text{dom } g \ni x = (\eta, \varphi) \mapsto \bar{\eta} + g(x)$. $\square$

As an example, if we have $w = (\eta, \varphi, y) \in \Sigma$ with $\text{rng } p_2 = \{r\}$ and $\text{rng } p_3 = \{0\}$, an elementary exercise gives $w \notin \Sigma_0$ iff $r = -n^2 \pi^2$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. In fact, when $r = -n^2 \pi^2$, instead of bijectivity of $\ell_w = \partial_2 f_{0i}(w) : v_s F_i \rightarrow v_s F_i$, we have $\ell_w^{-1}[\{\mathbf{0}_{F_i}\}] = \{C s_n : C \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $s_n = \langle \sin(n\pi t) : t \in I \rangle$, and $\text{rng } \ell_w = \{v \in v_s F_i : \int_0^1 v \cdot s_n = 0\}$. Thus $\text{rng } \ell_w$ and $\ell_w^{-1}[\{\mathbf{0}_{F_i}\}]$ are (topologically) complemented subspaces of F_i .

More interesting (and more laborious, of course) results analogous to Theorem 4 might be obtained by following the above lines and, for example, developing further the study in [W; pp. 368–369].

In the previous examples we had a "fully nonlinear" (or implicit) first order initial value problem and an explicit second order boundary value problem for an ordinary scalar differential equation. We proved that in both cases the corresponding *solution relation for smooth data* actually is a *smooth map locally* around each "regular" pair (data, solution). We used Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, and verification of their conditions was a relatively simple matter.

Corresponding results for partial differential equations require much more work since we need to apply various "a priori estimates". This is already illustrated in our next example where we study nonlinear initial value problems corresponding to a particularly simple linear partial differential operator, namely $y \mapsto y_t + y_x$.

5 Example. We study the equation $y_t + y_\theta = \varphi(t, \theta, y(t, \theta))$ on the closed half-cylinder $\mathbb{R}_+ \times S^1$ with initial condition $y(0, \theta) = y_0(\theta)$. To have a precise setting which can be written in a simple manner, we interpret the equation for functions $y : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by imposing the periodicity requirements $y(t, \eta + 1) = y(t, \eta)$ and $\varphi(t, \eta + 1, \xi) = \varphi(t, \eta, \xi)$. The equation then becomes

$$(*) \quad \partial_1 y + \partial_2 y = \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y] \quad \text{with } y(0, \cdot) = y_0.$$

We can further rewrite this $y = \bar{y}_0 + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$, where $\bar{y}_0(t, \eta) = y_0(\eta - t)$ and $\mathcal{I}(a, z)(t, \eta) = \int_a^t (z \circ ?_\tau)(t, \eta) d\tau$ with $?_\tau(t, \eta) = (\tau, \eta - t + \tau)$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} (y - \bar{y}_0)(t, \eta) &= y(t, \eta) - y_0(\eta - t) = y(t, \eta) - y(0, \eta - t) \\ &= \int_{\tau=0}^t y(\tau, \eta - t + \tau) d\tau = \int_0^t \langle y(\tau, \eta - t + \tau) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}_+ \rangle' \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^t (\partial_1 y(\tau, \eta - t + \tau) + \partial_2 y(\tau, \eta - t + \tau)) d\tau \\
&= \int_0^t \varphi(\tau, \eta - t + \tau), y(\tau, \eta - t + \tau) d\tau \\
&= \int_0^t (\varphi \circ [\text{id}, y] \circ ?_\tau)(t, \eta) d\tau = \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])(t, \eta),
\end{aligned}$$

from which one easily deduces the equivalence $(*) \Leftrightarrow y = \bar{y}_0 + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$, assuming for example that φ is smooth and y is of class C^1 , as we shall do.

If we have a locally convex space $S(\dots \mathbb{R} \times \dots)$ of functions $y : \dots \mathbb{R} \times \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $S(\dots S^1 \times \dots)$ its topological linear subspace with underlying set formed by the y with $y(\dots \eta, \dots) = y(\dots \eta + 1, \dots)$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$.

For $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and an interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, we write $C^{0,i}(I \times \mathbb{R}) =$

$$= \leq_{\text{LCS}} \text{-inf} \{ G : C(I \times \mathbb{R}) \leq G \text{ and } \forall l \in i^+ ; p_G^l \in \mathcal{L}(G, C(I \times \mathbb{R})) \},$$

where $p_G^l = \{(y, \partial_2^l y) : y \in v_s G\}$ with $\partial_2^l y$ defined by the recursion $\partial_2^0 y = y$ and $\partial_2^{k+1} y = \partial_2(\partial_2^k y)$. Generally, the space $C^{0,i}(I \times \mathbb{R})$ is Fréchet. For I compact, we have $C^{0,i}(I \times S^1)$ a Banach space, and as a canonical norm for it we use

$$y \mapsto \|y\|_{C^{0,i}} = \sup \{ |r| : \exists l \in i^+ ; r \in \text{rng}(\partial_2^l y) \}.$$

We put $E_0 = C^\infty(S^1)$, and let E_1 be the topological linear subspace of $E_A = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times S^1 \times \mathbb{R})$ with $v_s E_1$ formed by the φ such that every $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ has some $M < \infty$ with $\varphi(t, \eta, \xi) = 0$ for $t \leq T$ and $M \leq |\xi|$. Note that $v_s E_1$ is not a $\tau_{rd} E_A$ -closed set, whence E_1 is not a Fréchet space. We put $E = E_0 \cap E_1$, and $F = C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times S^1)$. We consider the solution relation Σ of $(*)$ having as members exactly the $(x, y) = (y_0, \varphi, y)$ such that $x = (y_0, \varphi) \in v_s E$ and $y \in v_s C^1(\mathbb{R}_+ \times S^1)$ and $y = \bar{y}_0 + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$. We now have

6 Theorem. *The membership $(E, F, \Sigma) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ with $\text{dom } \Sigma = v_s E$ holds.*

Proof. Let $b = \mathbf{0}_F$ and $g = \Sigma$. Taking $\Delta = \{(i, j) : i, j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } i \leq j\}$, we apply Theorem 4.3 with $F_i = C^i([0, i] \times S^1)$ and the functions f_i and f defined by the prescription $(x, y) = (y_0, \varphi, y) \mapsto y - \bar{y}_0 - \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$. The functions ρ_{ij} and ρ_i we define by $y \mapsto y|([0, i] \times \mathbb{R})$. Since $v \mapsto \mathcal{I}(0, v)$ gives a continuous linear map $F_i \rightarrow F_i$ for $i \in I_1 = \mathbb{N}$, by Theorem 3.6 and Proposition 3.1, we then have $(E \cap F_i, F_i, f_i) \in C_\Pi^\infty$. Lemmas c and e below together give $\text{dom } \Sigma = v_s E$. It remains to prove $\tilde{g} = (E, F, \Sigma) \in C_\Pi^\infty$, for which we must verify conditions (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.3.

For $g = f^{-\iota}[\{b\}]$ in (1), we trivially have " $\supseteq$ ", and the converse follows from Lemma e below. That g_i is a function follows from Lemma a below, and we have $\text{dom } g_i \subseteq v_s E = \text{dom } g$ trivially. For condition (2) from Remarks 3.7(b) with $a = \partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]$, we obtain $\partial_2 f_i(x, \rho_i y) u = u - \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot u)$, whence Lemmas d, e, and a show that (2) holds. Now Theorem 4.3 gives $\tilde{g} \in C_\Pi^\infty$. $\square$

For the following lemmas, when $I = \mathbb{R}_+$ or $I = [t_0, t_0 + T]$ with $t_0, T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, writing $S = v_s C(I \times S^1 \times \mathbb{R})$, we let $S_3(I) = \{\varphi : \varphi, \partial_3 \varphi \in S\}$. We further put $S_2(I) = \{\varphi : \varphi, \partial_2 \varphi, \partial_3 \varphi, \partial_3 \partial_2 \varphi, \partial_3 \partial_3 \varphi \in S\}$, and let $S_1(I)$ be the subset of $S_2(I)$ formed by φ such that every $t_1 \in I$ has some $M < \infty$ with $\varphi(t, \eta, \xi) = 0$ for $t \leq t_1$ and $M \leq |\xi|$. Then $v_s E_1 = S_1(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap v_s C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$.

a Lemma. (uniqueness) *Let $\varphi \in S_3(I)$ and $a, u, v \in v_s C^0(I \times S^1)$, where $I = \mathbb{R}_+$ or $I = [0, T]$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then $[u - v = \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, u]) - \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, v])] \Rightarrow u = v$ and $[u = \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot u) \Rightarrow \text{rng } u = \{0\}]$ are valid.*

Proof. Let $y = u - v = \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, u]) - \varphi \circ [\text{id}, v]$ for the first implication. Defining $a(t, \eta) = \int_0^1 (\partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, su + (1-s)v])(t, \eta) ds$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} y(t, \eta) &= \int_0^t (\varphi \circ [\text{id}, u] \circ ?_\tau(t, \eta) - \varphi \circ [\text{id}, v] \circ ?_\tau(t, \eta)) d\tau \\ &= \int_0^t \int_0^1 ((\partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, su + (1-s)v] \cdot y) \circ ?_\tau)(t, \eta) ds d\tau = \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot y)(t, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Fixing $L \in I$, and writing $\sigma(t) = \sup\{|y(t, \eta)| : \eta \in \mathbb{R}\}$, it suffices to show that $\sigma(t) = 0$ for all $t \in J = [0, L]$. Put $M = \sup\{|r| : r \in a[J \times \mathbb{R}]\}$, and note that σ is continuous. By $y = \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot y)$, we have $\sigma(t) \leq M \int_0^t \sigma$, hence $\frac{d}{dt}(e^{-Mt} \int_0^t \sigma) \leq 0$, and consequently $\int_0^t \sigma \leq 0$, whence $\sigma(t) = 0$ follows. This deduction at the same time verified the second implication. $\square$

b Lemma. (apriori estimates) *With $L, R, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ let $I = [t_0, t_0 + L]$, and let $\varphi \in S_2(I)$ and $F_i = C^{0,i}(I \times S^1)$ with $i = 0, 1$. Writing*

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 &= \sup\{|r| : r \in \varphi[I \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}] \cup \partial_3 \varphi[I \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}]\}, \\ M_1 &= \sup\{|r| : r \in \varphi[I \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}] \cup (\partial_2 \varphi \cup \partial_3 \varphi)[I \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}]\}, \text{ and} \\ M &= \sup\{|r| : r \in (\partial_3 \varphi \cup \partial_2 \partial_3 \varphi \cup \partial_3 \partial_3 \varphi)[I \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}]\}, \text{ then hold} \end{aligned}$$

- (1) *if $t_0 = 0$ and $v, y \in v_s F_i$ and $y = v + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$, then $\|y\|_{F_i} \leq (1 + \|v\|_{F_i}) e^{LM_i} - 1$,*
- (2) *if $u, v \in \bar{B}_{F_1}(R)$, then $\|\mathcal{I}(t_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, u]) - \mathcal{I}(t_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, v])\|_{F_1} \leq LM(2 + R)\|u - v\|_{F_1}$.*

Proof. We first note that for (1) we may assume $M_i \neq \infty$, since in the case $L \neq 0$ the assertion otherwise is trivial, and a moment's thought shows that it also holds if $L = 0$. Likewise, for (2) we may assume $M \neq \infty$. Now to prove (1), we observe that $z = \partial_2 y$ in the case $i = 1$ satisfies the equation $z = c + \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot z + b)$, where $c = \partial_2 v$ and $b = \partial_2 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]$ and $a = \partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]$. Writing $C_i = \|v\|_{F_i}$ and $\sigma_1(t) = \sup\{\sigma_0(t), \sigma(t)\}$, where $\sigma_0(t) = \sup\{|y(t, \eta)| : \eta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and $\sigma(t) = \sup\{|z(t, \eta)| : \eta \in \mathbb{R}\}$, we have $\|y\|_{F_i} = \sup\{\sigma_i(t) : t \in I\}$, whence it suffices to prove $\sigma_i(t) \leq (1 + C_i) e^{LM_i} - 1$.

From $z = c + \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot z + b)$, we get $\sigma(t) \leq C_1 + M_1 \int_0^t (1 + \sigma)$, where $\mathbf{1} = I \times \{1\}$. Using $\varphi(t, \eta, y(t, \eta)) = \varphi(t, \eta, 0) + \int_0^1 \partial_3 \varphi(t, \eta, sy(t, \eta)) y(t, \eta) ds$, we get $\sigma_0(t) \leq C_0 + M_0 \int_0^t (1 + \sigma_0)$ from $y = v + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$. Altogether, these give $\sigma_i(t) \leq C_i + M_i \int_0^t (1 + \sigma_i)$, whence $\langle e^{-M_i t} \int_0^t (1 + \sigma_i) : t \in I \rangle'(t) \leq (1 + C_i) e^{-M_i t}$, and consequently $\int_0^t (1 + \sigma_i) \leq e^{M_i t} \int_0^t (1 + C_i) e^{-M_i s} ds$ for $t \in I$. Hence finally

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i(t) &\leq C_i + M_i e^{M_i t} \int_0^t (1 + C_i) e^{-M_i s} ds \\ &= C_i + e^{M_i t} (1 + C_i) (1 - e^{-M_i t}) = (1 + C_i) e^{M_i t} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (2), putting $y = \mathcal{I}(t_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, u]) - \mathcal{I}(t_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, v])$ with u, v fixed, note that we can write

$$y(t, \eta) = \int_{t_0}^t \int_0^1 (\partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, su + (1-s)v] \cdot (u - v))(\tau, \eta - t + \tau) ds d\tau,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{and hence } \partial_2 y(t, \eta) &= \int_{t_0}^t \int_0^1 (\partial_2 \partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, s u + (1-s)v] \cdot (u-v) \\
&\quad + \partial_3^2 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, s u + (1-s)v] \cdot (s \partial_2 u + (1-s) \partial_2 v) \cdot (u-v) \\
&\quad + \partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, s u + (1-s)v] \cdot (\partial_2 u - \partial_2 v))(\tau, \eta - t + \tau) ds d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

From these we get $\sigma_0(t) \leq LM \|u - v\|_{F_0}$ and $\sigma(t) \leq LM (\|u - v\|_{F_0} + R \|u - v\|_{F_0} + \|u - v\|_{F_1}) \leq LM(2+R) \|u - v\|_{F_1}$, and (2) then follows. $\square$

c Lemma. (existence) *Let $I = \mathbb{R}_+$ or $I = [0, T]$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then all $v \in C = v_s C^{0,1}(I \times S^1)$ and $\varphi \in S_1(I)$ have $y \in C$ with $y = v + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$.*

Proof. Fix v, φ , and for $t \in I$, let $S(t)$ be the set of all $z \in v_s C^{0,1}([0, t] \times S^1)$ with $z = v + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, z])$. By Lemma a, then $S(t) = \emptyset$ or singleton. Writing $T = \{t \in I : S(t) \neq \emptyset\}$ and $t_1 = \sup T$, it suffices to prove $t_1 = \sup I$ and that T is closed, since then $y = \bigcup \{S(t) : t \in I\}$ is the required solution. Noticing that T is an interval, to proceed indirectly, we assume $t_1 < \sup I$ or $t_1 = \sup I \notin T$, and show that a contradiction follows. We first observe that $t_1 \geq 0$, since we have $v|(\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}) \in S(0)$. It suffices to show that a contradiction follows in each of the following cases: (a) $t_1 = 0$, (b) $0 < t_1 < \sup I$, (c) $t_1 = \sup I \in \mathbb{R} \setminus T$.

Writing $I_1 = I \cap [0, t_1 + 1]$ and $\Phi = \bigcup \{\partial_3^j \partial_\nu^i \varphi : i, j = 0, 1; \nu = 2, 3\}$, we put $A = \|v|(I_1 \times \mathbb{R})\|_{C^{0,1}}$ and $M = \sup \{1 + |r| : r \in \Phi[I_1 \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}]\}$. Now with $R = 4(1+A)(1+Mt_1 e^{Mt_1})$, we take $J = [t_0, t_2]$, where t_0 and t_2 in the above three cases are defined according to

- (a) $t_0 = 0$ and $t_2 = L = \inf \{\sup I, \frac{1}{3}(MR)^{-1}\}$,
- (b) $t_0 = t_1 - T_1$ and $t_2 = t_1 + T_1$, where $T_1 = \inf \{t_1, \sup I - t_1, \frac{1}{6}(MR)^{-1}\}$,
- (c) $t_0 = t_1 - L$ and $t_2 = t_1$, where we now have $L = \inf \{t_1, \frac{1}{3}(MR)^{-1}\}$.

Then we pick $y \in S(t_0)$, define $z^0(t, \eta) = v(t, \eta) + \int_0^{t_0} (\varphi \circ [\text{id}, y] \circ \tau_\tau)(t, \eta) d\tau$ for $(t, \eta) \in J \times \mathbb{R}$, and put $F_! = C^{0,1}(J \times S^1)$. If now $z = z^0 + \mathcal{I}(t_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, z])$ for some $z \in v_s F_!$, a simple exercise shows that we then obtain $y \cup z \in S(t_2)$, a contradiction. Thus it suffices to construct z .

We consider the function $\varrho : v_s F_! \rightarrow v_s F_!$ given by $z \mapsto z^0 + \mathcal{I}(t_0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, z])$. If we can show that ϱ is a contractor $\bar{B}_{F_!}(R) \rightarrow \bar{B}_{F_!}(R)$, the Banach fixed point theorem gives z with $(z, z) \in \varrho$, and we are one. Using (1) and (2) of Lemma b, the reader may verify that indeed $\varrho| \bar{B}_{F_!}(R)$ is a contractor.

As a hint in this verification we mention the following. With $\alpha = LM(2+R) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, it suffices to obtain the inequalities $\|\varrho(\mathbf{0}_{F_!})\| + \alpha R \leq R$ and $\|\varrho(u) - \varrho(v)\| \leq \alpha \|u - v\|$. The latter one is just (2) of Lemma b. With

$$\begin{aligned}
z_0(t, \eta) &= \int_0^{t_0} \varphi(\tau, \eta - t + \tau, y(\tau, \eta - t + \tau)) d\tau, & \text{we have} \\
\varrho(\mathbf{0}_{F_!})(t, \eta) &= v(t, \eta) + z_0(t, \eta) + \int_{t_0}^t \varphi(\tau, \eta - t + \tau, 0) d\tau,
\end{aligned}$$

and to estimate $\|z_0\|$, one utilizes (1) of Lemma b. Then it is a bit tedious verification to show that also $\|\varrho(\mathbf{0}_{F_!})\| + \alpha R \leq R$ holds. $\square$

d Lemma. (existence) *If $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $I = \mathbb{R}_+$ or $I = [0, T]$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$, then any $a, v \in C = v_s C^{0,i}(I \times S^1)$ have $u \in C$ with $u = v + \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot u)$.*

Proof. By Lemma a, it suffices to show the assertion for $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$. For a while assuming it for $i = 1$, we now prove that the full result $\forall i; \forall a, v; \dots$ follows then

by induction on i . Indeed, suppose we have the result for fixed $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $u = v + \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot u)$ with $a, v \in D = v_s C^{0, i+1}(I \times S^1)$. Then we have $u \in C$, and $z = \partial_2 u$ satisfies $z = \partial_2 v + \mathcal{I}(0, \partial_2 a \cdot u) + \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot z)$, whence by the inductive assumption and by Lemma a, we have $z \in C$, consequently $u \in D$.

It thus suffices to treat the case $i = 1$. With $F_0 = C^0(I \times S^1)$, let $A = \|v\|_{F_0}$ and define $\chi(s) = (\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_0)^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^s (\chi_0(-\sigma) - \chi_0(\sigma)) d\sigma$, where we have $\chi_0(s) = \exp((s-1)^{-1}(s-2)^{-1})$ for $1 < s < 2$, and $\chi_0(s) = 0$ otherwise. Then with $M = 2 \sup(\text{rng } \chi') \cdot \|a\|_{F_0}$, we put $B = (1 + A) e^{MT}$.

Now taking $\varphi : (t, \eta, \xi) \mapsto \chi(B^{-1}\xi) a(t, \eta) \xi$ in Lemma c, we have some u with $u = v + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, u])$, and to verify $u = v + \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot u)$, it suffices to show $\|u\|_{F_0} \leq B$. This indeed is the case since Lemma b(1) gives

$$\|u\|_{F_0} \leq (1 + A) e^{MT} - 1 < (1 + A) e^{MT} = B. \quad \square$$

e Lemma. (regularity) *Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $I = \mathbb{R}_+$ or $I = [0, T]$ with $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Also let $\varphi \in v_s C^\infty(I \times S^1 \times \mathbb{R})$ and $y_0 \in v_s C^\infty(S^1)$ and $a, v \in C = v_s C^i(I \times S^1)$. The implications $[y = \bar{y}_0 + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]) \in v_s C^{0,1}(I \times S^1) \Rightarrow y \in v_s C^\infty(I \times S^1)]$ and $[u \in v_s C^{0,i}(I \times S^1) \text{ and } v = u - \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot u) \Rightarrow u \in C]$ then are valid.*

Proof. Let $y = \bar{y}_0 + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]) \in v_s C^{0,1}(I \times S^1)$. Putting $z = \partial_2 y$, we then have $z = \bar{y}'_0 + \mathcal{I}(0, \partial_2 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y] + \partial_3 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y] \cdot z)$. Using this, we show inductively for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ that we have $y \in D = v_s C^{0,i}(I \times S^1)$. The case $i = 1$ being our assumption, assume the assertion for i . By Lemmas d and a, we have $z \in D$, whence $y \in v_s C^{0,i+1}(I \times S^1)$, and the induction is completed.

To prove $y \in v_s C^\infty(I \times S^1)$, we (again) recall H. A. Schwarz' theorem which (roughly) says that if $\partial_{\iota_1} z$ and $\partial_{\iota_1} \partial_{\iota_2} z$ are defined and $\partial_{\iota_1} \partial_{\iota_2} z$ is continuous, then $\partial_{\iota_2} \partial_{\iota_1} z = \partial_{\iota_1} \partial_{\iota_2} z$. Writing $e_1 = (1, 0)$ and $e_2 = (0, 1)$ and $c(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \text{Card}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{-\iota}[\{e_1\}])$, it now suffices that inductively on $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we prove

$$(r_k) \quad \forall N, \boldsymbol{\eta}; N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \{e_1, e_2\}^N \text{ and } c(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \leq k \Rightarrow \\ \text{dom}(d(\boldsymbol{\eta})y) = I \times \mathbb{R} \text{ and } d(\boldsymbol{\eta})y \text{ is continuous.}$$

Above, we already proved (r_0) . So suppose we have (r_k) , and fix $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \{e_1, e_2\}^N$ with $c(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = k + 1$. Considering any $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$ with $c(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1) = k$, we have

$$d(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1) \partial_1 y = d(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1)(-\partial_2 y + \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]) = -d(\langle e_2 \rangle^{\wedge} \boldsymbol{\eta}_1) y + d(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1)(\varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]),$$

where $d(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1)(\varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$ can be written (via appropriate recursive definition, and inductive proof) as a finite sum of terms $\partial_1^{l_1} \partial_2^{l_2} \partial_3^{l_3} \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y] \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{l_3} d(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i) y$, where $c(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i) \leq k$. By (r_k) then $\text{dom}(d(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1) \partial_1 y) = I \times \mathbb{R}$ holds and $d(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1) \partial_1 y$ is continuous. Now applying Schwarz' theorem in a finite induction, we see that we can write $d(\boldsymbol{\eta}) y = d(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1)(\partial_1 y)$ for some $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$ with $c(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1) = k$. The induction is completed.

The latter implication follows by induction similar to the above, once we first note $v = u - \mathcal{I}(0, a \cdot u) \Rightarrow \partial_1 u = \partial_1 v + \partial_2 v - \partial_2 u + a \cdot u$. $\square$

To give an application of Theorem 4.5, we modify Example 5 thus considering

7 Example. We take the equation $y_t + y_\theta = \varphi(t, \theta, y(t, \theta))$ now on the compact cylinder $I \times S^1$ with $I = [0, T]$ for $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$ fixed, initial condition as before. We put $E = E_0 \cap E_1$ with $E_0 = C^\infty(S^1)$ and $E_1 = C^\infty(I \times S^1 \times \mathbb{R})$, and $F = C^\infty(I \times S^1)$, which all are Fréchet spaces. Letting the solution relation Σ be the

set of $(y_0, \varphi, y) \in v_s(E \cap C^1(I \times S^1))$ with $y = \bar{y}_0 + \mathcal{I}(0, \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y])$, we show

8 Theorem. *The membership $(E, F, \Sigma) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ is valid.*

Proof. The set Σ is a function by Lemma a, and Lemma e gives $\text{rng } \Sigma \subseteq v_s F$. Hence arbitrarily given $z \in \Sigma$, it suffices to obtain W with $z \in W \in \tau_{rd}(E \cap F)$ and $(E, F, \Sigma \cap W) \in C_\Pi^\infty$. As in the proof of Theorem 6, with $b = \mathbf{0}_F$, we have $\Sigma = f^{-1}[\{b\}]$, when taking $F_i = C^i(I \times S^1)$, we define f and f_i as before. By Theorem 4.5, it thus suffices to show that with the notations of Definition 4.4, we obtain a $B\partial_2$ -extension of $(E \cap F, F, f)$ in C_Π^∞ around (z, b) , when we define ρ_i and ρ_{ij} by $y \mapsto y$. Choosing $i_0 = 1$ and $W_0 = v_s(E \cap F_1)$, conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 4.4 are verified as in the proof of Theorem 6. Also condition (3) is satisfied, since by Lemma e we have $y^1 \in v_s F \subseteq \text{rng } \rho_{1j}$ for all $j \in I_1 = \mathbb{N}$ whenever $(x^1, y^1, \mathbf{0}_F) = (x^1, y^1, \rho_1 b) \in f_1$. We are done. $\square$

For example, with $T < 2$ taking $y_0(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\varphi(t, \eta, \xi) = \xi^2$ and $y(t, \eta) = (2 - t)^{-1}$, we have $(y_0, \varphi, y) \in \Sigma$, whence by Theorem 8 an open neighborhood U of (y_0, φ) in E exists with $U \subseteq \text{dom } \Sigma$. Put loosely, in particular the equation in question has a unique solution z for each data $x = (y_1, \varphi_1) \in U$, and z depends smoothly on x , the map $U \ni x \mapsto z$ is smooth.

Of course, the result of Theorem 8 with equally simple proof could also have been obtained by using Theorem 4.3 instead of 4.5.

Remark. Since the spaces E, F are now Fréchet, we have $\tilde{g} = (E, F, \Sigma) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ exactly in case $\Sigma : E \supseteq \text{dom } \Sigma \rightarrow F$ is a $\mathcal{Lip}^\infty$ map in the sense [KM; p. 118, Def. 12.1]. In principle, we could then prove $\tilde{g} \in C_\Pi^\infty$ using [FK; Thm. 4.8.5, p. 153], but this would not be very practical. Indeed, we would be lead to the following.

Arbitrarily fix smooth functions $\hat{c}_0 : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{c}_1 : \mathbb{R} \times I \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\hat{c}_0(\sigma, \eta + 1) = \hat{c}_0(\sigma, \eta)$ and $\hat{c}_1(\sigma, t, \eta + 1, \xi) = \hat{c}_1(\sigma, t, \eta, \xi)$, and define $c_0(\sigma)(t, \eta) = \hat{c}_0(\sigma, \eta - t)$ and $c_1(\sigma)(t, \eta, \xi) = \hat{c}_1(\sigma, t, \eta, \xi)$. Letting $\tilde{y}$ be the set of all pairs $(\sigma, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times (v_s F)$ with $y = c_0(\sigma) + \mathcal{I}(0, c_1(\sigma) \circ [\text{id}, y])$, the set $S = \text{dom } \tilde{y}$ should be open, and we should have a $\mathcal{Lip}^0$ map $\tilde{y} : \mathbb{R} \supseteq S \rightarrow F$ in the sense referred to above. Further, taking any compact $K \subseteq S$ and any bounded set B in F , then also $\{u \in v_s F : \exists \sigma \in K ; u - \mathcal{I}(0, \partial_3 c_1(\sigma) \circ [\text{id}, \tilde{y}(\sigma)] \cdot u) \in B\}$ should be a bounded set in the space F .

Theorem 4.5 requires the functions ρ_{ij} to be injective. In the previous example this was trivial by $v_s C^{i+1}(\Omega) \subseteq v_s C^i(\Omega)$, and verification of condition (3) in Definition 4.4 was based on the fact that the solution of a differential equation is more differentiable than apriori. To present an example where (3) fails, we take complex scalars, and consider the following

9 Example. We take the equation $y' = \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]$ with $y(0) = y_0$, where with the notations of Example 3.9 we have $\varphi : \Omega = D(1) \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $y : D(1) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ holomorphic. We are interested to know whether $(y_0, \varphi) \mapsto y$ defines a holomorphic map $E \rightarrow F$ when we put $E = \mathcal{C} \cap H(\Omega)$ and $F = H(D(1))$.

To construct the setting for application of Theorem 4.5, writing $F_r = H_b(\bar{D}(r))$,

we take $\mathcal{R} = \{(r, s, \rho_{rs}) : 0 < r \leq s < 1\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \langle (F_r, f_r, \rho_r) : 0 < r < 1 \rangle$, where $\rho_{rs}y = \rho_r y = y|_{\bar{D}(r)}$ and $f_r(y_0, \varphi, y)(\eta) = f(y_0, \varphi, y)(\eta) = y(\eta) - y_0 - \int_0^\eta \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]$, here put concisely but a bit imprecisely since $\text{dom } \rho_{rs} \neq \text{dom } \rho_r$ and $\text{dom } f_r \neq \text{dom } f$. The functions ρ_{rs} are injective by the familiar uniqueness property of holomorphic functions.

Let us study whether $\mathcal{F}$ is a $B\partial_2$ -extension of $(E \sqcap F, F, f)$ in C_Π^∞ by $\mathcal{R}$ around $(\mathbf{0}_E, \mathbf{0}_F, \mathbf{0}_F)$. From Example 3.9, we obtain $(E \sqcap F_r, F_r, f_r) \in C_\Pi^\infty$. Conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 4.4 are satisfied since they reduce to proving that with $a = \partial_2 \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]$ the differential equation $(v' - u' + a \cdot u)(\eta) = 0$ for $|\eta| < r$ with initial condition $u(0) = v(0)$ has a unique solution $u \in v_s F_r$ for all $v \in v_s F_r$. The solution is $u = e^A(u_0 + \int_0^\eta (e^{-A} v'))$, where $A = \int_0^\eta a$ and $u_0 = \bar{D}(r) \times \{u(0)\}$.

We now study whether condition (3) holds. It reduces to the following *problem*. Let $0 < r < s < 1$, fix $(\eta_0, \varphi) \in v_s E$, and let $y_n \in v_s F_s$ and $y^1 \in v_s F_r$ be such that for $|\eta| < r$ we have the differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} y'_n(\eta) &= (1 - n^{-1}) \varphi(\eta, y_n(\eta)) \quad \text{with } y_n(0) = (1 - n^{-1}) \eta_0 \\ y^{1'}(\eta) &= \varphi(\eta, y^1(\eta)) \quad \text{with } y^1(0) = \eta_0 \end{aligned}$$

and also $y_n|_{\bar{D}(r)} \rightarrow y^1$ uniformly on $\bar{D}(r)$. Then we should be *able to extend* y^1 to a vector of the space $H_b(\bar{D}(s))$. Here is a counterexample: Take $\eta_0 = 1$ and define $\varphi(\eta, \xi) = s^{-1} \xi^2$. Writing $a_n = 1 - n^{-1}$, we have $y_n(\eta) = a_n s (s - a_n^2 \eta)^{-1}$ for $|\eta| \leq s$, and $y^1(\eta) = s(s - \eta)^{-1}$ for $|\eta| \leq r$. There is no $\bar{y}^1$ with $(\bar{y}^1, y^1) \in \rho_{rs}$.

In fact, there is no possibility to achieve $(E, F, \Sigma) \in C_\Pi^\infty$ for the solution relation $\Sigma = f^{-\iota}[\{\mathbf{0}_F\}]$ of our present equation, since $\mathbf{0}_E \in \text{dom } \Sigma$ is not an interior point, i.e., we have $\mathbf{0}_E \notin \text{Int}_{\tau_{rd}E}(\text{dom } \Sigma)$. Indeed, since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^2 r^n = 0$ for $0 < r < 1$, given any $U \in \mathcal{N}_o E$, choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, and taking $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ sufficiently large with $n\varepsilon > 1$, and defining $\varphi(\eta, \xi) = n(n+1)\eta^n \xi^2$, we have $x = (\varepsilon, \varphi) \in U$, but there is no y with $(x, y) \in \Sigma$. To see this, we only need to observe that the solution of $y'(\eta) = n(n+1)\eta^n (y(\eta))^2$ with $y(0) = \varepsilon$ is given by $y(\eta) = \varepsilon(1 - n\varepsilon\eta^{n+1})^{-1}$, which is not defined for all $|\eta| < 1$.

6

Generalized well-posedness

Let us say that $\mathcal{M} \times \tau$ is a *topologized class of mappings* in case τ is a function $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}$ with $\tau \backslash X$ a topology for each $X \in \mathcal{O}$, and $\mathcal{M}$ is a class of triples (X, Y, f) , where $X, Y \in \mathcal{O}$ and $f \subseteq (\bigcup(\tau \backslash X)) \times (\bigcup(\tau \backslash Y))$ is a function. Now given such a class $\mathcal{M} \times \tau$, let us consider a family $\Sigma = \langle \tilde{\Sigma}_A : A \in \mathcal{A} \rangle$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a filter base on the set $\Omega = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$, and $\tilde{\Sigma}_A = (X_0, Y_A, \Sigma_A) \in \mathcal{O}^{\times 2} \times \mathbf{U}$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Also assume we are given the set $S \subseteq \bigcup(\tau \backslash X_0)$ and the pair $P = (\Sigma_0, Z_0)$, where $\Sigma_0 \subseteq \Sigma_\Omega$ and $Z_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\bigcup(\tau \backslash Y_\Omega) \subseteq \bigcup(\tau \backslash Z_0)$ and $(\tau \backslash Z_0) \cap (\bigcup(\tau \backslash Y_\Omega)) \subseteq \tau \backslash Y_\Omega$ in case $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$ holds. We then consider the following *well-posedness* properties:

- (1) $\forall x \in S ; \exists A \in \mathcal{A}, U \in \tau \backslash X_0 ; x \in U \cap (\text{dom } \Sigma_A)$ and $(X_0, Y_A, \Sigma_A|U) \in \mathcal{M}$,
- (2) $\forall A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\Omega\}, x \in S ; \exists U \in \tau \backslash X_0 ;$
 $x \in U \cap (\text{dom } \Sigma_A)$ and $(X_0, Y_A, \Sigma_A|U) \in \mathcal{M}$,

- (3) $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\forall x \in S; \exists U \in \tau \backslash X_0;$
 $x \in U \cap (\text{dom } \Sigma_\Omega)$ and $(X_0, Y_\Omega, \Sigma_\Omega|U) \in \mathcal{M},$
- (4) $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\forall w \in \Sigma_0; \exists W;$
 $w \in W \in (\tau \backslash X_0) \times (\tau \backslash Z_0)$ and $(X_0, Y_\Omega, \Sigma_\Omega \cap W) \in \mathcal{M}.$

We now propose the following terminology: Let us say that Σ is *locally well-posed for S in $\mathcal{M}$ by τ* iff (1) holds. Analogously, in case of (2) we speak of *almost global* well-posedness, and we say that Σ is *globally well-posed for S in $\mathcal{M}$ by τ* iff (3) holds. In the case of (4) we say that Σ is *almost well-posed for P in $\mathcal{M}$ by τ* .

In case $S = \bigcup (\tau \backslash X_0)$, we drop "for S " in the phrases just introduced associated with (1), (2), (3), and dropping "by τ " presupposes $\tau = \text{pr}_2| \text{dom}^2 \mathcal{M}$. Well-posedness *for small data* shall refer to the case $S = \{\mathbf{0}_{X_0}\}$, when $\mathcal{O}$ is a class of structured $\mathbf{K}$ -vector spaces, i.e., the members of $\mathcal{O}$ are pairs $X = (Z, T)$ where Z is a $\mathbf{K}$ -vector space and T is the "structure" of X .

0 Remark. One observes that in the case of a singleton $\mathcal{A} = \{\Omega\}$, global and local well-posedness are equivalent, and almost global then always holds by $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{\Omega\} = \emptyset$. Further, almost global well-posedness of a family $\Sigma = \langle \tilde{\Sigma}_A : A \in \mathcal{A} \rangle$ holds iff the singleton families $\{(A, \tilde{\Sigma}_A)\}$ for $A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\Omega\}$ all are glob/locally well-posed. Finally, in case $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$ holds, global well-posedness of Σ is equivalent to that of the singleton family $\{(\Omega, \tilde{\Sigma}_\Omega)\}$.

1 Example. The assertion about "improved local well-posedness in H^{s*} " contained in [KR; Thm. 1, p. 5] expressed in our terminology is the following: Let $\mathcal{M}_s$ be the class of all triples (X, Y, f) , where X, Y are sets and $f \subseteq X \times Y$ is a function. Fixing $s \in \mathbb{R}$ with $3 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} < s$, and the functions $\langle \gamma^{\iota_1 \iota_2} : 0 \neq \iota_1, \iota_2 \in 4 \rangle$ and $\langle \varphi^{\iota_1 \iota_2} : \iota_1, \iota_2 \in 4 \rangle$ satisfying "suitable conditions" for a constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and taking $\mathcal{A} = \{[0, T] : T \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$, we define $\Sigma = \langle (X_0, Y_A, \Sigma_A) : A \in \mathcal{A} \rangle$ and the set S and the family τ as follows.

We take $X_0 = v_s(H^s(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R}^3))$, and for fixed $A = [0, T] \in \mathcal{A}$ let Y_A be the set of all continuous functions $y : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the function $\bar{y}$ on $[0, T]$ defined by $\bar{y}(t) \cdot \psi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} y(t, \eta) \cdot \psi(\eta) d\eta$ for test functions ψ , i.e., for $\psi \in v_s \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, is "continuous into H^s and of class C^1 into H^{s-1} ".

Then we let Σ_A be the set of all pairs $(x, y) = (x_0, x_1, y) \in X_0 \times Y_A$ such that $\bar{y}(0) = x_0$ and $\bar{y}'(0) = x_1$, and such that y satisfies

$$(?) \quad \partial_0^2 y - \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \gamma^{ij} \circ y \cdot \partial_i \partial_j y = \sum_{i,j=0}^3 \varphi^{ij} \circ y \cdot \partial_i y \cdot \partial_j y$$

in a suitable sense. Since the authors of [KR] do not explicitly define what this "suitable sense" should mean, we do not bother to make it clear here either. One possible interpretation, however, is sketched in Remark below.

We put $\tau = \langle \mathcal{P}_s Q : Q \in \mathbf{U} \rangle$, where $\mathcal{P}_s Q = \{U : U \subseteq Q\}$, the power set, i.e., the discrete topology on a set Q . Finally, let S be the set of all $x = (x_0, x_1) \in X_0$ having "suitable" H^s - H^{s-1} -norm $\leq \lambda$.

With these "definitions" now [KR; Thm. 1] asserts Σ to be locally well-posed for S in $\mathcal{M}_s$ by τ . In addition to this well-posedness result, there is also an assertion (obviously containing a typographic mess) about some "Strichartz estimate",

but this does not interest us here.

Remark. A precise meaning for (?) can be given along the following lines. Writing $\Omega =]0, T[\times \mathbb{R}^3$, for $y \in Y_A$ we interpret each term as a vector in the (strong topological) dual space $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ of $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$. Observe that we have the "naturally" defined continuous linear injections

$$C(A, H^{s-1}) \hookrightarrow C(A, H^{s-2}) \hookrightarrow C(A, L^2) \hookrightarrow L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),$$

and the (continuous) bilinear maps "induced" by pointwise products

$$b_1 : C(\Omega) \cap L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),$$

$$b_2 : C(A, L^2) \cap C(A, L^2) \rightarrow C(A, L^1) \hookrightarrow L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega).$$

With $z = y|_{\Omega}$, we directly have $\gamma^{ij} \circ z, \varphi^{ij} \circ z \in v_s C(\Omega)$. The term $\partial_0^2 y$ has a natural interpretation as a vector of $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$, and as do $\partial_i y$ for $i = 0, \dots, 3$, and $\partial_i \partial_j y$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, 3$ in the space $C(A, L^2)$. Then we interpret $\gamma^{ij} \circ y \cdot \partial_i \partial_j y$ as $b_1(\gamma^{ij} \circ z, \partial_i \partial_j y)$, and $\varphi^{ij} \circ y \cdot \partial_i y \cdot \partial_j y$ as $b_2(\varphi^{ij} \circ z, b_2(\partial_i y, \partial_j y))$.

2 Example. Let $E = H^\infty(\mathbb{R}) = \leq_{\text{LCS}} \sup \{H^\sigma : \sigma \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where we consider H^σ as a (real) locally convex space of continuous functions $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ via the Sobolev embedding $H^\sigma(\mathbb{R})_{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{R})_{\mathbb{C}}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$. Taking $\mathcal{A} = \{[0, T] : T \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$ as before, we define $\Sigma_1 = \langle (E, F_A, \Sigma_A) : A \in \mathcal{A} \rangle$ as follows.

For fixed $I \in \mathcal{A}$, let S_I be the set of all pairs $(x, y) \in (v_s E) \times \mathbb{C}^{I \times \mathbb{R}}$ such that $\tilde{y} = \langle \langle y(t, \eta) : \eta \in \mathbb{R} \rangle : t \in I \rangle \in v_s C^1(I, E)$. Then we let $F_I \in \text{LCS}(\mathbb{R})$ be the unique one such that $v_s F_I \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{I \times \mathbb{R}}$ with $y \mapsto \tilde{y}$ defining a linear homeomorphism $F_I \rightarrow C^1(I, E)$. Arbitrarily fixing a smooth $\chi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we put $S = \{x \in v_s E : \sup(\text{rng}(|x|^2 \cdot (\chi' \circ |x|^2)^2)) < \frac{1}{2}\}$.

For the nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$(*) \quad i \partial_1 y + \partial_2^2 y = y \cdot \chi' \circ |y|^2 \cdot \partial_2^2 (\chi' \circ |y|^2) \quad \text{with } y(0, \cdot) = \tilde{y}(0) = x,$$

we finally let Σ_I be set of all $(x, y) \in S_I$ with $(*)$.

Letting $\mathcal{M}_c$ be the class of maps (E, F, f) of (real) locally convex spaces with $\text{dom } f \in \tau_{rd} E$, by [Po1; Cor. 7.6, p. 739] now Σ_1 is locally well-posed for S in C_c^1 , and almost globally well-posed for small data in $\mathcal{M}_c$. In [Po2; Thm. 4.24, p. 167, Thm. 4.25, p. 168], parallel result are obtained for local well-posedness in C_c^0 , and almost global for small data in $\mathcal{M}_c$.

We observe that the "general nature" of the well-posedness result of Example 1 is considerably weaker than that of this example, since firstly the class $\mathcal{M}_s$ there is only of maps between unstructured sets, whereas here we have locally convex spaces and even C_c^1 maps. Secondly, there τ gives the discrete topology on a set, but here it is the locally convex one.

3 Example. With $N \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed, let Ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^N$, and writing $k = [\frac{1}{2}N] + 2$, let then $E = H_0^{k+3}(\Omega) \cap H_0^{k+3}(\Omega)$ with the Sobolev spaces again considered as spaces of continuous functions $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via the Sobolev embedding theorem. Now taking $\mathcal{A} = \{[0, T] : T \in \mathbb{R}^+\} \cup \{\mathbb{R}_+\}$, we shall construct the family $\Sigma = \langle (E, F_A, \Sigma_A) : A \in \mathcal{A} \rangle$ as follows.

For each fixed $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we let $F_A \in \text{LCS}(\mathbb{R})$ be the unique one having $v_s F_A \subseteq C(A \times \Omega)$, and such that $y \mapsto [\bar{y}, \bar{y}']$ defines a topological linear isomorphism of

F_A onto a topological linear subspace of $C(A, H^1(\Omega) \cap H^0(\Omega))$ with $y \mapsto \tilde{y}|]0, T[$ defining a surjection $v_s F_A \rightarrow \bigcap \{v_s H^i(]0, T[, H^{k+3-i}(\Omega)) : i = 1, 2, 3\}$ whenever $0 < T \in A$. The Sobolev spaces in the latter requirement are considered as spaces of continuous functions via the respective Sobolev embeddings, whereas $H^1(\Omega)$ and $H^0(\Omega) \cong L^2(\Omega)$ denote Hilbert(iz)able spaces of distributions.

For $i = 1, \dots, N$ fixing $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $2 \leq r_i \in \mathbb{N}$, and the functions F, σ_i with the properties A_1 and A_3 in [Z; p. 1049], we let Σ_A be the set of all $(x, y) = (x_0, x_1, y) \in v_s(E \cap F_A)$ satisfying $y(0, \cdot) = x_0$ and $\partial_0 y(0, \cdot) = x_1$ and

$$\square y = \Delta \partial_0 y + F \circ (Dy) + \sum_{i=1}^N \partial_i (\sigma_i \circ (\partial_i y) + A_i (\partial_i \partial_0 y)^{r_i}),$$

where $Dy = [y, \partial_0 y, \partial_1 y, \dots, \partial_N y, \partial_1 \partial_0 y, \dots, \partial_N \partial_0 y]$.

Finally letting $S \in \mathcal{N}_o E$ be determined by the description for $W_0 \cap W_1$ in [Z; p. 1049], now Theorem 2.3 in [Z; p. 1050] asserts that Σ is globally well-posed for S in C_c^0 . In particular, it asserts that the family Σ is globally well-posed in C_c^0 for small data.

Remark. Possibly one cannot allow general bounded open Ω in Example 3 above. In [Z; p. 1048], one loosely speaks of a bounded domain having "sufficiently smooth boundary". For precise requirements in order to have $H^\sigma(\Omega) \cong W^{\sigma,2}(\Omega)$, see for example [W; Thm. 5.3, p. 95, Thm. 5.4, pp. 95–96, Thm. 2.1, p. 39].

In addition, even local existence of a solution in [Z] remains problematic since not a word is said to prevent $\liminf \langle T_n \rangle = 0$ when $[0, T_n[$ denotes the maximal (positive) interval of existence for the system (5), (6) there on p. 1051 of ordinary nonlinear second order differential equations for $\langle T_{jn} : j = 1, \dots, n \rangle$.

4 Example. Let $\Sigma_2 = \{(I_0, \tilde{f})\}$, where $\tilde{f} = (E, F, \Sigma)$ with E, F, Σ as in Example 5.5, and I_0 is any nonempty set. For example, we may fix $I_0 = \mathbb{R}_+$. Further, let $\Sigma_3 = \langle \tilde{f}_I : I \in \mathcal{A} \rangle$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is as in Examples 1 and 2 above, and we have $\tilde{f}_I = (E, F_I, \Sigma_I)$ defined as follows. We take $E = C^\infty(S^1) \cap C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times S^1 \times \mathbb{R})$ and $F_I = C^\infty(I \times S^1)$, and let Σ_I be the set of $(y_0, \varphi, y) \in v_s(E \cap C^1(I \times S^1))$ satisfying $\partial_0 y + \partial_1 y = \varphi \circ [\text{id}, y]$ with $y(0, \cdot) = y_0$.

From Theorems 5.6 and 5.8, we now obtain the result that Σ_2 is globally well-posed in C_Π^∞ , and Σ_3 is almost globally well-posed for small data in C_Π^∞ . We observe that the "nature" of these well-posedness results is stronger than that of Example 2 in three respects. First, the class $\mathcal{M}$ here is smaller. Second, the well-posedness here contains also a regularity and a wider uniqueness result hidden in the definition of Σ_ι . Third, also the nonlinearity φ is allowed to vary here.

Observe that the above stated well-posedness of Σ_3 is not the exact content of Theorem 5.8 but only a corollary of it. The exact content can be reformulated as follows. *For any fixed $I \in \mathcal{A}$, take $E = C^\infty(S^1) \cap C^\infty(I \times S^1 \times \mathbb{R})$, let F_I and Σ_I be as above, and put $S = \text{dom } \Sigma_I$. Then the singleton family $\{(I; E, F_I, \Sigma_I)\}$ is globally well-posed for S in C_Π^∞ .* Theorem 5.8 does not give any information about S but we trivially have $\{\mathbf{0}_E\} \subseteq S$.

5 Example. With the notations of Example 5.3, let $\Sigma = \{(I; E, C^\infty(I), \Sigma)\}$ and $P = (\Sigma_0, C^2(I))$. The assertion of Theorem 5.4 now is that Σ is almost well-

posed for P in C_{Π}^{∞} . Theorem 5.2 can be formulated similarly.

References

- [AS] Averbukh, V. I. & Smolyanov, O. G.: The theory of differentiation in linear topological spaces, *Russian Math. Surveys* **22** (1967) no 6, 201–258.
- [Du] Dudley, R. M.: *Real Analysis and Probability*, Wadsworth, Pacific Grove 1989.
- [FK] Frölicher, A. & Kriegl, A.: *Linear Spaces and Differentiation Theory*, Wiley, Chichester 1988.
- [Ge] Geba, D.-A.: A local well-posedness result for the quasilinear wave equation in $\mathbf{R}^{2+1}$, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **29** (2004) no 3-4, 323–360.
- [Hi1] Hiltunen, S.: Implicit functions from locally convex spaces to Banach spaces, *Studia Math.* **134** (1999) no 3, 235–250.
- [Hi2] Hiltunen, S.: Mapping families, differentiation, and Lie groups of diffeomorphisms (article in preparation).
- [Hi3] Hiltunen, S.: Banach space situations and the loss of derivatives (article in preparation).
- [Hi4] Hiltunen, S.: Smooth solution maps for nonlinear wave equations (article in preparation).
- [Ho] Horváth, J.: *Topological Vector Spaces and Distributions*, Addison–Wesley, Reading 1966.
- [Jr] Jarchow, H.: *Locally Convex Spaces*, Teubner, Stuttgart 1981.
- [KS] Keel, M. & Smith, H. F. & Sogge, C. D.: Almost global existence for quasilinear wave equations in three space dimensions, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **17** (2004) no 1, 109–153.
- [Ke] Keller, H. H.: *Differential Calculus in Locally Convex Spaces*, LNM **417**, Springer, Berlin 1974.
- [Ky] Kelley, J. L.: *General Topology*, GTM **27**, Springer, New York 1985.
- [KR] Klainerman, S. & Rodnianski, I.: Improved local well-posedness for quasilinear wave equations in dimension three, *Duke Math. J.* **117** (2003) no 1, 1–124.
- [KM] Kriegl, A. & Michor, P. W.: *The Convenient Setting of Global Analysis*, Amer. Math. Soc. Survey **53**, Providence 1997.
- [Pi] Pizanelli, D.: Applications analytiques en dimension infinie, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **96** (1972) 181–191.
- [PS] Ponce, G. & Sideris, T.: Local regularity of nonlinear wave equations in three space dimensions, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **18** (1993) no 1-2, 169–177.
- [Po1] Poppenberg, M.: Smooth solutions for a class of fully nonlinear Schrödinger type equations, *Nonlinear Analysis* **45** (2001) 723–741.
- [Po2] Poppenberg, M.: An inverse function theorem in Sobolev spaces and applications to quasilinear Schrödinger equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **258** (2001) 146–170.
- [W] Wloka, J.: *Partial Differential Equations*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1992.
- [Z] Zhijian, Y.: Initial boundary value problem for a class of non-linear strongly damped wave equations, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **26** (2003) no 12, 1047–1066.

Seppo Hiltunen
Helsinki University of Technology
Institute of Mathematics, U311
P.O. Box 1100
FIN-02015 HUT
FINLAND
e-mail: shiltune@cc.hut.fi